United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2022 No. 48

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 17, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 10, 2022, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

MINORITY HEALTH DISPARITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, today I rise with a great sense of gratitude. Gratitude for the opportunity to serve the people's House and gratitude for passing my first standalone bill, H.R. 189, the John Lewis National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities Research Endowment Revitalization Act. It passed the House and Senate, and on a bipartisan basis to boot. The bill is on its way to the President's desk, and on Friday, President Joe Biden will sign it in a White House ceremony that this kid from the harbor area of Los Angeles never dreamed was possible.

This is a full circle moment for me, one that made me tear up last night as I sat to reflect how I got here and how my passion on the issue of disparities in health took shape.

In 1998 as a young college student, I had an opportunity to work as an intern in the Clinton White House. I worked in the Office of Public Liaison doing African-American outreach under Ben Johnson and Minyon Moore. It was during my work there that I learned about the issue of racial health disparities. At the time, United States Surgeon General David Satcher highlighted the issue, and it became a passion of mine.

A year later I would continue my work on the issue and in the healthcare space at the NAACP with Hilary Shelton. Ben Johnson and Hilary Shelton mentored and inspired me. They encouraged me to keep up my work on the issue.

Today, as a Member of Congress, the issue of racial health disparities and the need for us to close the healthcare gap is among my top priorities. In that light, during the 116th Congress when I was in my second term, an opportunity arose to work with organizations like the Association of Minority Health Professions Schools and others on a bill to help fund research on health disparities at schools of excellence.

I remember approaching our friend, the late John Lewis, about the bill. He encouraged me to fight and to get it across the finish line, and he agreed to become an original cosponsor.

In this Congress, the 117th Congress, I renamed the bill in honor of my friend, the late John Lewis. H.R. 189 is now the John Lewis National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities Research Endowment Revitalization Act.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia, Representative BUDDY CARTER, for being a co-lead on the bill. The Senate bill, S. 320, was introduced and championed by Senators BILL CASSIDY and BRIAN SCHATZ. I am grateful for their work to get this across the finish line and Senator CASSIDY for being gracious.

H.R. 189 will, once again, allow for current and former NIMHD or Health Resources & Services Administration Centers of Excellence to receive research endowment funding, money that is critical in the fight to reduce minority health disparities.

The research endowment program at the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities provides funding to the endowments of academic institutions across the country. Schools like Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science will qualify; Morehouse School of Medicine, the University of Puerto Rico School of Dental Medicine, Tuskegee University College of Veterinary Medicine, Xavier University of Louisiana College of Pharmacy, and many more will be eligible to receive funding under this bill.

The goals of the program include promoting minority health and health disparities research capacity and infrastructure, increasing the diversity and strength of the scientific workforce, and enhancing the recruitment and retention of individuals from health disparity populations that are underrepresented in the scientific workforce.

On Friday, 24 years after getting my start in politics at the White House, I will be back there again, this time as a Member of Congress to see H.R. 189 become law and move us one step closer to ending the disparities in public health facing communities of color.

For that I am grateful.

Printed on recycled paper.

A PROMISE TO FIRST DO NO HARM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, when I first became a doctor, I made a promise that I would never perform, assist, or support in any abortion or any abortion procedures. All doctors take an oath. They swear to first do no harm. I made a promise that I would never participate in the taking of a human life.

At 10 weeks a baby in their mother's womb has developed a beating heart. At 11 weeks, the baby will have developed elbows, fingers, and toes. And at 27 weeks, a baby inside the womb can hear their mother's voice. It is clear that these children are human—constructed in the image of God—and worthy of protection and worthy of love.

It is time to protect human life, it is time to protect the unborn, and it is time to end this egregious practice of abortion.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF DR. GEORGE HRUZA

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of Dr. George Hruza.

A graduate of New York University, Dr. Hruza went on to complete both a dermatology residency at New York University Medical Center as well as a laser surgery fellowship at Harvard Medical School. Later, Dr. Hruza completed a Mohs and dermatologic surgery fellowship at the University of Wisconsin-Madison with Dr. Fred Mohs.

Dr. Fred Mohs developed this revolutionary surgery—a technique that allows for the precise removal and the repair of skin cancer.

Throughout his career, Dr. Hruza has proven himself to be a leader in the field of dermatology. His tireless commitment to his patients and their families has undoubtedly saved countless lives.

Dr. Hruza has come to Washington and done skin cancer screenings for members of staff and Members of Congress—several who might be present here today.

As the American Academy of Dermatology's president, Dr. Hruza's relentless advocacy for innovation has helped to shape the way that skin cancer today is treated in the United States. Skin cancers were previously deadly. My own grandfather died from skin cancer, a skin cancer that would be treated today by someone like Dr. Hruza and cured.

It is my privilege to call Dr. George Hruza a leader, a colleague, and a friend of the United States Congress. As he continues his work as the United Skin Specialists Missouri director, I wish Dr. Hruza every continued success; his success in working to treat patients, his success in developing innovation, and his success as one of the leaders in dermatology not just in the United States but throughout the world.

CAREER AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Madam Speaker, as the coauthor of the bipartisan Strengthening Career and Technical Education in the 21st Century Act—the largest reform of skills-based education in more than a dozen years—I rise today to celebrate one institution that has become a national exemplar.

I am honored to join Congressman AUGUST PFLUGER from Texas in recognizing Dr. Gregory Williams at Odessa College. Odessa College has been named a top-10 community college by the Aspen Institute. Dr. Williams has seen both enrollment as well as students with passing grades increase year after year.

When we reformed CTE in 2018 and increased Federal funding by over 10 percent, we did so with educators like Dr. Williams in mind.

I commend Dr. Williams and Odessa College for their tremendous success. I will continue fighting for robust funding for skills-based and vocational education funding so that programs like Odessa's can flourish in my State of Illinois as well as across the country.

NATIONAL AMERICORPS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, this week many people will be celebrating National AmeriCorps Week. I will not be one of them. AmeriCorps has been around for almost 30 years, and in that time we have learned never to underestimate the ability of the Federal Government to muck things up.

No one denies that AmeriCorps began with good intentions, and I applaud the philanthropic spirit of those who volunteer out of a genuine desire to help those in need. However, I cannot applaud a bloated bureaucratic organization that is the poster child for fraud and mismanagement.

AmeriCorps is entrusted with 1.1 billion taxpayer dollars every single year. And every single year AmeriCorps proves it is an expert at wasting taxpayer funds.

For example, some AmeriCorps programs cost taxpayers four to eight times more money than programs that perform identical services. Even more concerning is the fact that neither Congress, the Inspector General, nor AmeriCorps itself have an idea of how taxpayer dollars are being managed. In fact, AmeriCorps' financial statements are so bad that they have not been able to be audited for the past 5 years.

According to AmeriCorps' Inspector General, if this occurred at a private organization there would be a ''wholesale resignation or firing of the leadership team, and the public would be shorting their stock.''

Even more concerning is the lack of oversight AmeriCorps provides over its grantees that are plagued with fraudulent activity. For example, a Hawaiian nonprofit executive was recently sentenced to 46 months in prison for embezzling over $500,000 from AmeriCorps, and a school district in St. Louis was found guilty of encouraging AmeriCorps volunteers to falsely inflate time sheets.

The private sector often does the same work as AmeriCorps but at a fraction of the price and with far less waste, fraud, and mismanagement.

It is our job as Members of the House of Representatives to ensure that taxpayer funds are protected. The power of the purse is one of our most important constitutional duties. We therefore must stop feeding the black hole that is AmeriCorps and instead empower States and local governments to meet the needs of their residents.

The last time AmeriCorps' programs were reauthorized was in 2009 with the passage of the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act which was named in honor of the late Senator who was the author of the legislation that governs many of AmeriCorps' programs.

Yet, despite the support for national service, Senator Kennedy himself emphasized the importance of proper stewardship of taxpayer dollars, noting during a 1993 floor speech on the establishment of the corporation that ''Congress will not, and should not, fund a program if it is unsuccessful.''

I agree with him. AmeriCorps has had 29 years to prove itself, and the only thing it has proven is that it is a drain on taxpayers and a massive disappointment. This is a failed agency that needs to be overhauled completely or just eliminated.

□ 1015

CONGRATULATING PRESIDENT BIDEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate President Biden for the progress our Nation has made this past year. In early 2021, the President took office during a global crisis and was determined to get America back on track. He knew we needed a comeback. He knew we needed to focus on building a better America.

So what did President Biden do? He invested in the American people, and he invested big. The boom was beginning.

In March 2021, the American Rescue Plan was signed into law. In total, a historic $1.9 trillion were put to work for the American people during the severe public health and economic crisis caused by COVID.

Since then, the American Rescue Plan has been helping us recover. We are now enjoying one of the strongest periods of economic growth in history, and we are building a better America.

If we look at the progress we have made over the past year, Madam Speaker, we can see how successful the American Rescue Plan truly has been.

The plan powered historic jobs recovery and produced the largest calendar increase in jobs on record. The unemployment rate dropped at a record pace, but we have also seen the biggest drop in long-term unemployment ever recorded in a 12-month span. Nearly 2.5 million people broke out of the cycle of long-term unemployment. Madam Speaker, this is huge.

As the Representative of a majority Latino district, I was especially proud to learn there were record drops in Latino and African-American unemployment rates. African-American unemployment fell by more than 30 percent. Latino unemployment fell from nearly 9 percent to 4.4 percent, the fastest drop ever recorded.

These are hardworking Americans going back to work, putting food on the table, and earning good paychecks. This is building a better America.

We have seen that when Americans have job opportunities, great things happen, and they do. That is why we also saw the lowest number of home foreclosures ever recorded. We also witnessed a record low number of credit card delinquencies.

The American Rescue Plan isn't only helping working adults. The American Rescue Plan's historic child tax credit benefits nearly 40 million families with 65 million children.

Madam Speaker, in my own home State, the child tax credit directly benefits nearly 7 million children, many in our area of Houston. Madam Speaker, that is a whole lot of children. Most families in Texas will receive several thousand extra dollars because of the increased 2021 child tax credit.

Because of these historic tax credits, child poverty rates have been slashed dramatically. In only 1 year, unemployment is at a record low, job opportunities are on the rise, and child poverty rates have been reduced. We are building a better America for all.

I am so proud we have a strong leader in the White House who is leading America to full recovery. President Biden got it right, Madam Speaker. He understood that betting on the American people is always a good idea. With the right resources, America will win. We will all win. It is just that simple. Together, we really are building a better America.

RECOGNIZING THE LEGACY OF DAVID RUDD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUSTOFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the legacy of David Rudd, who is retiring as the president of the University of Memphis.

Dr. David Rudd came to the University of Memphis in 2013 as the provost for the university. He had previously served as the dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science and scientific director of the National Center for Veterans Studies at the University of Utah.

President Rudd succeeded Dr. Shirley Raines as president and Brad Martin as interim president of the University of Memphis, becoming the University of Memphis president in 2014.

The University of Memphis has a student population of around 22,000 students, with 17 bachelor's degrees in more than 250 areas of studies, master's degrees in 54 subjects, doctoral degrees in 26 disciplines, and graduate certificate programs in 44 areas of study. The University of Memphis also has one of the finest law schools in the southeast United States.

No matter your alma mater, one thing most can agree on is that it is extremely challenging leading a school of higher education today, especially in the era of COVID.

With that said, the University of Memphis has flourished under David Rudd's tenure as president. There have been a number of major accomplishments during this time. Maybe the most significant achievement during the David Rudd era is the University of Memphis obtaining the research classification known as R1 by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. For the first time in its history, this puts the University of Memphis in the top tier of research universities across the Nation.

I asked my friend, Doug Edwards, the chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Memphis, about David Rudd. Doug told me: ''David Rudd is a transformative leader who has had a profound impact on the University of Memphis. He has elevated the stature of the university to that of the second flagship university in Tennessee and a top-tier research institution.''

Soon Dr. Rudd will take a well-deserved sabbatical from his leadership and administrative duties. When he comes back to the University of Memphis in the next year, he will return to teaching and research as a distinguished professor of psychology and will run the new Rudd Institute for Veteran and Military Suicide Prevention at the University of Memphis.

The institute is appropriately named. As a veteran of the Gulf war and a former Army psychologist, David Rudd is one of the Nation's leading experts on suicide prevention among our Nation's veterans.

We wish the utmost best to him and his wife, Dr. Loretta Rudd, herself a distinguished educator and researcher in higher education.

On behalf of the many alumni and residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee, Roberta and I congratulate, salute, and honor David Rudd for his remarkable and outstanding tenure as the president of the University of Memphis.

HONORING REVEREND FRED SHUTTLESWORTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a true civil rights pioneer, Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth, ahead of what would have been his 100th birthday on Friday, March 18.

Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth was a civil rights activist who led the fight against segregation and other forms of racism as a minister in Birmingham, Alabama. He was a cofounder of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, initiated and was instrumental in the 1963 Birmingham campaign, also known as Project C, for confrontation, to desegregate the city of Birmingham.

Regarded as one of the most courageous civil rights fighters in the South by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Reverend Shuttlesworth was a fearless freedom fighter who always stood up for what is right.

Shuttlesworth participated in the sit-ins against segregated lunch counters in 1960 and took part in the organization and completion of the Freedom Riders in 1961.

Throughout his amazing career, despite experiencing violent intimidation and numerous attempts on his life, Reverend Shuttlesworth remained vigilant in his fight for civil rights. The noted pastor of the Bethel Baptist Church is recognized as the key leader and organizer of the civil rights movement in Birmingham, Alabama.

In recognition of his lifelong dedication, President Clinton awarded Reverend Shuttlesworth the Presidential Citizens Medal in 2001. Shortly after, in 2008, the Birmingham-Shuttlesworth International Airport was named in his honor.

Although Reverend Shuttlesworth died at the age of 89 on October 5 of 2011, he has a long list of accomplishments. To that, the city of Birmingham is designating this Friday, March 18, as the Reverend Shuttlesworth Day in honor of the 100th anniversary of his birthday.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and the city of Birmingham to pay tribute to the extraordinary life and legacy of Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth as we designate March 18 as Reverend Shuttlesworth Day.

HONORING MRS. BEATRICE PRICE

Ms. SEWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable life and legacy of Beatrice Price, a pioneering Army nurse to the Tuskegee Airmen during World War II, who passed away at the age of 98 on March 4, 2022.

Joining the military shortly after completing nursing school, Mrs. Price

honorably served alongside the legendary Tuskegee Airmen until her discharge in 1948.

A trailblazer and pioneer in the field of nursing, Mrs. Price had a stellar 42-year career in nursing, spending more than 34 years working at the Birmingham VA Medical Center where she once again cared for our servicemen and servicewomen with great distinction until her retirement in January of 1988.

On a personal note, Mrs. Price was a source of great inspiration for me and so many young women. She was devoted to her church, her family, and her service to this Nation. A woman of tremendous faith, Mrs. Price served honorably during World War II alongside the legendary Tuskegee Airmen.

As Alabama's first Black Congresswoman, it was my high honor to bestow upon her a Congressional Gold Medal for her courage, bravery, and exemplary service. I was also thrilled to host Mrs. Price in Washington at the State of the Union in 2013.

For her many accomplishments, Mrs. Price was always gracious, always compassionate, and always humble. I am eternally grateful for our friendship, her mentorship, and our special bond. I thank her family for sharing her with the world.

May we find comfort in knowing that she lived a full and blessed life. Her legacy will live on in the hearts and actions of those she impacted. Rest in peace and power, thy good and faithful servant.

On behalf of Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the extraordinary life and legacy of Mrs. Beatrice Price and her tremendous service to this Nation.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Agriculture Week, which begins on March 20, a week dedicated to honoring and acknowledging the efforts and hard work of American farmers and farm families.

While farmers, ranchers, producers, foresters, and farmworkers should be celebrated year-round, National Agriculture Week shines a bright light on where our Nation's food, fiber, and fuel come from. I have always said every American interacts with agriculture at least three times a day, whether they realize it or not: breakfast, lunch, and dinner. It is a fundamental part of our lives, and it is the backbone of the American economy.

Celebrated during National Agriculture Week, National Agriculture Day began in 1973 as a way to recognize the unique value that farmers, ranchers, and foresters contribute to our society, contributions that have only grown in importance over the past 2 years as the world faced a pandemic, global supply chain disruptions, economic instability, and, now, war in Europe.

Being a farmer has never been an easy job by any means. Feeding and clothing our Nation and the entire world is a monumental task. Every day, America's farm families dedicate their minds and bodies to achieving that feat.

Unfortunately, many farmers today are facing rising input costs, shrinking profit margins, and unrelenting supply chain issues, much of which has been self-inflicted by leadership in Washington, yet they continue to persevere.

As Republican leader of the House Agriculture Committee, I am honored to represent farm families in rural America and serve as their reliable voice in the Halls of Congress.

National Agriculture Week encourages every American to: understand how food and fiber products are produced; appreciate the role agriculture plays in providing a safe, abundant, and affordable food supply; value the essential role of agriculture in our economy; and acknowledge and consider successful career opportunities in the agriculture industry.

As the Representative of Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District, I have the great privilege of working firsthand with many farmers and foresters. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, we are fortunate to have more than 59,000 farms. These men and women work hard to feed and clothe not just Pennsylvanians but our Nation and overseas. Their hard work results in agriculture being Pennsylvania's number one industry.

Agriculture and its associated industries contribute more than $135 billion, or about 18 percent of Pennsylvania's economy. The industry employs half a million workers, including 280,500 direct jobs.

I will end with one of my favorite quotes about agriculture from President Jefferson: ''Agriculture . . . is our wisest pursuit, because it will in the end contribute most to real wealth, good morals, and happiness.''

This sentiment rings just as true today as it did in President Jefferson's letter to George Washington in 1787. Our farm families truly embody the best of the American spirit through their moral integrity, hard work, and an unwavering dedication to their craft. Everyone in this Chamber and around the world benefits from the ''wise pursuit'' of agriculture, and we owe these patriots a resounding debt of gratitude.

I want to applaud the farmers, ranchers, and foresters who continue to devote their lives to American agriculture.

□ 1030

RUSSIA IS COMMITTING WAR CRIMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the House of Representatives heard from Ukrainian President Zelenskyy as he painted a haunting picture of pain inflicted on the Ukrainian people and the war crimes being waged on Ukrainians trying to keep themselves and their families safe.

It is clear, Madam Speaker, that Vladimir Putin has committed war crimes by violating international norms, including the Geneva Convention, in his violent and bloody war of conquest on Ukraine.

I, along with Congressman DAVID CICILLINE, have introduced a war crimes resolution, H. Res. 964, calling on the global community to hold Vladimir Putin and the Russian Government accountable for these war crimes.

Russian forces have used explosive weapons with wide-range effects near schools and populated areas, hitting them with missiles, rockets, and heavy artillery. It is clearly a violation of the Geneva Convention to target civilian and cultural sites.

On March 1, a Russian airstrike hit Freedom Square in Kharkiv, killing civilians and injuring dozens of innocent people.

On March 1, a Russian missile hit the location of the Babyn Yar Holocaust Memorial site, a place where thousands of Jewish people were killed between 1941 and 1943.

On March 3, 47 civilians were killed when Russia hit two schools and apartment buildings, injuring countless others. This is clearly a violation of the Geneva Convention.

We have also witnessed the attack of medical units. On March 9, Russian forces bombed a maternity and children's hospital in the city of Mariupol. The world watched as a pregnant woman was being carried lifeless from the hospital wreckage on a stretcher. Both she and her child passed away.

The World Health Organization has also confirmed several attacks on healthcare centers in Ukraine, causing countless deaths and injuries.

It is clearly a violation of the Geneva Convention to target nuclear facilities. On March 3, Ukrainian President Zelenskyy accused Russian forces of nuclear terror as Russian tanks shot at the nuclear blocks at a nuclear power station in Ukraine.

More than 3 million people are now refugees who have fled Ukraine, Madam Speaker. Each day in Ukraine, more than 70,000 children have become refugees. That accounts for 55 children fleeing the country every minute.

There have been over 2,000 civilian casualties in the country, and thousands upon thousands of people have

been injured. Yesterday, the International Court of Justice overwhelmingly found that Russia must immediately suspend its unlawful military invasion of Ukraine.

It is clear, Madam Speaker, that Vladimir Putin and the Russian Government have committed war crimes. They have invaded a sovereign nation and are attacking the very core of liberty and democracy. We must hold them accountable and do all we can to support the brave Ukrainians fighting for their freedom.

AVOID WAR THROUGH FINANCIAL EXCELLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BUSTOS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. CAWTHORN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Madam Speaker, when American projects weakness on the international stage, everyday Americans suffer. We know this. We are told this daily. But many everyday Americans feel that geopolitics is far removed from their lives.

So, let's answer the question: What does it cost for America to be weak on the world stage?

This cost is manifested at the pumps every day with 42 percent higher prices. It is shown as food prices soar. Meat, poultry, and eggs are all up over 10 percent.

Our weakness abroad produces hardships at home. If we lose our role as the world reserve currency, your buying power, your savings, and your property value could all sink to historic lows.

The preeminence of American currency has dominated the global landscape for decades, providing stability as the international bedrock of financial transactions and arrangements.

We are the world's reserve currency. We are the standard. But that great financial heritage is slipping away. Our children may soon call the world reserve currency by another name. Perhaps they will know it as the yuan.

The geopolitical ramifications of devalued and discarded American currency would not only signal a shift in financial confidence in the United States; it would dissolve our standing among global superpowers.

We are witnessing the death rattle of Pax Americana, meaning the era of American peace we have enjoyed in the world for decades.

America could lose a war with China without a single shot ever being fired if our dollar continues to be perpetually devalued.

Permanent Washington decision-makers, most of whom are over 30 to 50 years my senior, have clearly either not taken the time to sit and consider the cost of or, worse, simply ignored how hyperinflation is rotting the superiority of our Nation's currency and dragging with it young families, blue-collar workers, and the great American middle class.

American strength and leadership have been the driving force of peace for the last half century. Nations unified behind the stability of the U.S. dollar, in large part because we backed our greenbacks with gold—substance, not fluff. We were the manufacturers of the world. The shift from a gold standard to a fiat currency began to starve America's financial preeminence. You cannot inflate gold, but you can print money out of thin air. When a currency is built on nothing but paper, it literally grows on trees. With this dramatic shift, America's leverage on the world stage began to slip away.

There can be no globalism when America refuses to relinquish its position as the preeminent currency. Countries also think twice before incurring the wrath of the United States when their own financial stability is tied to the endurance of our monetary system.

But, instead, our inflated, hollow monetary systems have given way to fantastical foreign policy. We have surrendered our financial security as the superpowers of the world wait eagerly in the wings. Our collapse signals their emergence.

Saudi Arabia, which has exclusively sold its oil using U.S. dollars, is now considering selling oil for the Chinese yuan. The Chinese Communist Party has been posturing for years to topple the dollar with their tender.

When the U.S. dollar falls, America will no longer remain dominant on the world stage, and peace will end. It is already happening. Vladimir Putin has illegally and immorally invaded Ukraine. The world is coming unraveled as our tender's resiliency plummets.

But I am sure you are asking yourself at home: Does this have to happen? In short, the answer is no. We can reclaim the mantle of financial excellence we once held. We can become the leader of the world again without having to expend the lives of young Americans.

Stooping to military interventionism is the goal of the war hawks here in Congress who are bought and paid for by those who stand to profit from forever wars.

If we are wise and shrewd, we can avoid ever needing to put boots on the ground to ensure peace. We can do this by dominating the world's economy.

To bring peace without bloodshed is actually quite simple. The key is to immediately reduce gas prices and energy prices by drilling the hell out of the Permian Basin and by granting every lease and incentivizing all necessary infrastructure atop the Bakken shale.

Furthermore, we should aggressively onshore manufacturing back to America, dominate the world market on precious minerals, and stop shipping our jobs overseas.

A strong American economy creates a strong U.S. currency. When America sits atop the world, peace will continue. Tyrants of the world, like Putin and Xi Jinping, will fear us when the only way to buy and sell energy is by using the U.S. dollar.

It is our solemn responsibility to pass a peaceful and prosperous nation on to the next generation. We are the leaders of the world. It is time we start acting like it.

Drill, baby, drill. America first now, and America first forever.

BROAD-BASED SANCTIONS ARE ECONOMIC WARFARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the Ukrainian people who are facing a cruel and inhumane war of aggression from a tyrant, Vladimir Putin.

I also stand in solidarity with my Ukrainian-American constituents whose friends and families are in harm's way.

We must address this war with courage, foresight, and humility. I am appalled by the extraordinary cruelty of Putin's war. I am also moved by the courage of the Ukrainians and also by the courage of the antiwar protesters in Russia, risking 15 years in prison for speaking out against Putin's aggression.

We must stand unified with the Ukrainian people. But even as we stand with the Ukrainian people, we must avoid the knee-jerk calls to make this conflict even worse.

One thing we should have learned throughout our history is that policy decisions we make simply based on fear or rage rarely end well. Increasingly, we are hearing voices calling for the United States and NATO to enter into war with Russia. For the most part, they are not saying this directly. They are using euphemisms like no-fly zone.

A no-fly zone is not simply declared. It must be militarily enforced. As the President said, a no-fly zone would mean the United States entering the war. It would mean the beginning of World War III.

We must reject this completely. The stakes are incredibly high. There has never been, on this Earth, a war between two or more nuclear powers.

There is a reason for this. Even in the madness of the Cold War, leaders around the world understood that nuclear war would mean the annihilation of humanity.

There are voices now that are shockingly casual about the risk of nuclear war. I am asking the American people to not believe them. Do not believe them when they tell you that it is going to be limited. Do not believe them when they tell you nuclear winter isn't real, or it isn't that bad. They don't know that. They can't know that.

Aside from the very real risk of nuclear escalation, we have placed the strictest sanctions in history on Russia with no clear off-ramps or criteria for lifting them.

What is clear is that broad-based sanctions will be devastating for civilians. What is less clear is that Putin or

his inner circle will be hurt or deterred by them. As Secretary Albright told me in a committee in 2019: ''We have learned that comprehensive sanctions . . . hurt the people.''

Collective punishment is a moral evil, especially when it is authorized with no end in sight. The embargo in Cuba has been in place for over 60 years. It has caused incredible human suffering. It has not produced its intended outcome.

Maximum pressure sanctions on Iran and Venezuela have made it hard for people living in those countries to buy food and medicine, but it has done nothing to weaken their governments.

We also know that there are a number of countries who depend on Russia and Ukraine for their food supplies. Russia and Ukraine produce one-third of the world's wheat. Already, there are reports their countries are refusing to export their own food supplies for fear of a shrinking supply.

There is a very real chance that this war and our sanctions could lead to famine in places like Sudan, which imports half of its wheat from Russia. The Russian people did not choose this war, and the Sudanese people certainly did not. Our policies should not punish them.

I don't support broad-based sanctions on any country, adversary, or ally. They are economic warfare, and we should all oppose them like we oppose military actions.

□ 1045

Madam Speaker, this war was sparked by greed, imperialism, and dehumanization. We must lead with humanity. Let us stand with not just the people of Ukraine who are giving their lives fighting off a cruel war of conquest, but also the brave Russian dissidents who are risking their own lives to stand up to Putin.

Let's stand for a world where the rule of law is respected, human rights abusers face justice, and we see each other first and foremost as fellow humans.

Madam Speaker, I pray for wisdom. I pray for justice. Above all, I pray for peace.

CONGRATULATING THE BEARDEN HIGH SCHOOL LADY BULLDOGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Bearden High School Lady Bulldogs basketball team for winning their first Tennessee Secondary School Athletic Association title in program history. Bearden won the Class 4A State championship game on March 12, defeating the Farragut Lady Admirals 52–34.

Both teams reached the State tournament after a season's worth of perseverance and teamwork. The Lady Bulldogs compiled 36 wins during the regular season while the Lady Admirals won 39 games. In the State tournament, Bearden and Farragut sailed through the quarterfinals and semifinals to set up a clash with each other in the championship game. It was the fifth time these two teams met during the season.

This was a historic matchup, Madam Speaker. Neither Bearden nor Farragut had appeared in a girls' State championship game before that. It also marked the first time two Knox County schools competed against each other in the State championship game. Regardless of the winner of this game, Knox County would have its first girls' basketball State championship team since the Austin-East Roadrunners won it all in 2007.

As a Bearden High School alumnus, I am excited that my Lady Bulldogs were victorious in the championship, but I represent both these communities in Congress. The Lady Admirals should be proud of what they achieved this year, and I am happy to recognize Farragut for an incredibly successful season. Both squads did an excellent job representing east Tennessee in the State tournament. Congratulations to the girls and their coaches. Go, Bulldogs.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE'S BASKETBALL PROGRAMS

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the University of Tennessee's basketball programs on making their respective 2022 NCAA tournaments. By punching their tickets to the big dance, both the men's and women's teams built on UT athletics' long history of college basketball success.

The University of Tennessee is the only school to qualify for every women's NCAA tournament. The women's program is making its 40th straight—40th straight, Madam Speaker—NCAA tournament appearance after winning 23 contests during the regular season. Competing as the number four seed in the Wichita region, the Lady Volunteers won't need to travel far for their first game of the tournament. Thompson-Boling Arena will host it in Knoxville. This venue will be the first for this year's competition, which is where the Lady Volunteers will take on the Buffalo Bulls on March 19.

On the men's side, the Volunteers defeated the Texas A&M Aggies last Saturday to win the 2022 Southeastern Conference tournament championship. It is not in my notes, but I do want to note, since Representative BARR might be watching this, we also defeated Kentucky very handily also. This is the fifth tournament championship in program history and the first since 1979. The team earned the number three seed in the South Region for its regular season performance and faces the Longwood Lancers in the first round this afternoon in Indianapolis, Indiana.

I wish the best of luck to the Lady Volunteers head coach Kellie Harper and the Volunteers men's head coach Rick Barnes, all their players, coaches, and support staff as they compete in this year's NCAA's basketball tournament. I was also an alumnus of the University of Tennessee, and I still have 4 years of eligibility left in basketball. Go Vols.

BUDDY'S BAR-B-Q CELEBRATES 50 YEARS

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Buddy's Bar-b-q, a local favorite in east Tennessee, and one of my local favorites as well. My mama and daddy and I always used to eat there after church on Sundays. It was always delicious. I ate there with my best friend Chris Heagerty last week, and it was still delicious, and it was very price conscious, I will say. It is not too expensive.

Buddy and LaMuriel Smothers dreamed of opening a restaurant that served quality, homestyle barbecue with classic southern hospitality. In 1972, they made that dream a reality by opening the first Buddy's Bar-b-q in Knoxville. It quickly became a hit. Crowds packed into the restaurant to enjoy LaMuriel's delicious recipes, which are still on the menu today, and listen to the wonderful bluegrass bands that played on Friday nights. I remember a band called Knoxville Grass used to play there, and I would sing a little bit of the tunes here, but I don't want to run everybody off or be called out.

Ten years later, of course, Buddy's Bar-b-q was featured at the 1982 World's Fair in Knoxville, where I worked at the always very loud and impressive video expo. After appearing at the fair, though, the word spread far and wide that Buddy's Bar-b-q was outstanding. The restaurant became a barbecue staple in Tennessee, a reputation that it has maintained for the past 40 years.

Complementing the outstanding food at Buddy's Bar-b-q are the restaurant's charitable efforts in our community. The restaurant launched Buddy's Race for the Cure to honor Buddy after he died of cancer in 1992 and supports Alzheimer's Tennessee in honor of LaMuriel. It also hosts Mission Mondays and supports local schools, regional nonprofits, and the University of Tennessee. Additionally, Buddy's Bar-b-q will provide catering and support for the Congressional Medal of Honor Society's annual gathering to honor all the living Medal of Honor recipients. This event is again being held in Knoxville this year for the second time, and Buddy's will provide classic southern hospitality.

I congratulate the entire Smothers family; my good friends Anthony and Lisa Edwards, Mark and Jaime Lemoncelli; and everyone involved in making Buddy's Bar-b-q a wonderful success these past 50 years. It is good. If you all ever get to Knoxville, please stop in.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASTEN. Madam Speaker, Vladimir Putin's horrific war against the Ukrainian people has all of us talking about how to prevent him and other oil-rich autocrats like him from being able to afford to commit these heinous acts in the future. It has also, all of a sudden, made everybody in this town an energy expert. I am here to set the record straight about a few things.

One, Russia is a petrostate. Fossil fuels are funding Putin's war crimes against the Ukrainian people. Fossil fuels are funding Putin's assault on democracy. Fossil fuels are funding the demise of post-World War II stability in Europe. Putin's power comes from fossil fuels and our world's dependence on them.

Two, you cannot end an addiction by increasing the supply. No amount of increased fossil fuel extraction in the United States, which, I should note, would take years, can take away Russia's influence on the global energy market. Since fossil fuels are a global commodity, as long as we depend on them, Americans will continue to be subject to wild price fluctuations based on the whims of petro-dictators.

Three, when the fossil fuel industry and the conservative politicians they bankroll go on television claiming the solution to the pain you are feeling at the pump today is to drill more in the U.S., they are lying to you. They are lying in a cynical attempt to take advantage of a tragic situation to line their own pocketbooks. You deserve the truth.

The truth is that there is only one long-term solution to stop funding oil-rich autocrats and insulate Americans from energy price inflation: Double down on our transition to cleaner, cheaper, domestically produced renewable energy and energy efficiency.

The horror that we are seeing in Ukraine makes it abundantly clear that clean energy isn't just necessary to protect against climate devastation. Preventing wars and protecting our national security demands investments in clean energy. American energy independence demands investments in clean energy. Lowering costs demands investments in clean energy.

Every day we fail to reach an agreement on the baseline climate investments that were passed in the House is a day that Americans pay the price at the pumps and oil-rich autocrats profit.

That is why I have led nearly 90 of my House colleagues in calling on President Biden to lead a climate restart to reconciliation negotiations centering the cost-saving clean energy investments as the path forward to deliver tangible results to the American people. This is a code red moment, and it cannot wait any longer.

SUPPORTING WOMEN WHO ARE SEXUALLY ABUSED

Mr. CASTEN. Madam Speaker, sexual assault is common among female students of all ages, races, and ethnicities. On college campuses, one in five women in college experience a sexual assault. Studies show that students are at the highest risk of sexual assault in the first few months of their first and second semesters in college.

This is unacceptable. Every woman everywhere has the right to live free from abuse. This is why it was so important to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, and I am proud that we finally passed that reauthorization into law in our omnibus package.

But we also have to ensure that women who are at risk have trained, trusted professionals who they can reach out to when they are at risk. That is why I was pleased to introduce, and see included in the final package, my amendment to ensure that appropriate campus faculty, such as academic advisers or professionals who deal with students on a daily basis, are trained to recognize victims of sexual and domestic violence. We have to ensure that our campuses are equipped with the tools and knowledge to combat violence against women.

If you are sexually assaulted, your experience is valid. It is not your fault, and you are not alone. Please know there is a community of people ready and willing to believe you, trust you, and support you.

TRADING IN INDIVIDUAL STOCKS BY CONGRESSIONAL STAFF AND MEMBERS

Mr. CASTEN. Madam Speaker, there is an iron rule of investing: unless you are Warren Buffet or have access to insider information, you won't make money trying to outsmart the market. Invest in mutual funds and index funds to build your wealth.

And yet, according to a recent New York Times article, Members of Congress are not only buying and selling a lot of individual stocks, but we consistently outperform the market.

I don't see Warren Buffet here nor do I see a lot of people with long track records of successful stock picking before they came to Congress, but I do see a lot of people with access to a lot of inside information, who know when we are about to change our defense contracts or invest in domestic semiconductor capacity, update our antitrust laws, or buy vaccines, and have the ability to trade on that inside information.

Our responsibilities as Members of Congress are a trust from the voters. Ethics matters. That is why I don't personally own or trade individual stocks, and I encourage every Member of Congress to stop trading stocks immediately. Even the appearance of impropriety by one Member cheapens us all.

That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the Ban Conflicted Trading Act, which would bar Members of Congress and senior congressional staff from buying or selling individual stocks and other investments and from serving on any corporate boards while in office.

We owe it to the American people to pass that bill and sign it into law.

AMERICA'S ENERGY CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address America's energy crisis and the administration's continued assault on American-made energy that has killed jobs, increased our dependency on foreign oil, and most recently jeopardized our national security.

Just 1 year ago, our country was comfortably meeting our energy needs, and we were a net exporter of energy for the first time in 50 years. However, under this administration's leadership or lack thereof, we have dramatically increased our dependence on foreign oil, sent gas prices sky high, and increased heating bills during the winter.

Instead of turning to America's own energy sector to meet our energy needs and continue to make us independent, this administration is asking countries like Iran and Venezuela to compensate for the ban on Russian imports and ignoring American energy producers.

In doing so, the administration is prioritizing oil produced by dictators over American energy producers who support jobs and businesses here at home.

I urge the administration to flip the switch and reduce our dependence on foreign energy by increasing production of oil and gas at home. We can do this.

MODERNIZING AND STREAMLINING DIAGNOSTIC TESTING

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to legislation that I have been working on with the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) called the VALID Act, a bipartisan, bicameral solution to modernize and streamline diagnostic testing through establishing a risk-based framework for review and approval of laboratory-developed tests or in vitro diagnostic tests.

Many of you might be thinking, why does this matter? Well, let me tell you. Right now in America, laboratory-developed tests are not regulated for clinical or analytical accuracy. This is a problem. CMS and FDA have both told us that this is so. They do not regulate these tests.

Every single day there is a new story of inaccuracy of these diagnostic tests that can be life changing and life altering with severe consequences. As a doctor, it breaks my heart to hear of situations where, for example, a young woman falsely tests positive for a potential risk for cancer, takes preventive action to save her life potentially,

an irreversible action that might prevent her from ever having more children, only to find out that the test was falsely positive and inaccurate.

A recent article in The New York Times outlined the inaccuracy of some prenatal diagnostic blood tests, which were very inaccurate. This may lead to potential life-changing medical decisions based on these false results. It is absolutely devastating.

If passed, the VALID Act would protect patients and save lives by ensuring Americans can rely on the test results they receive while also allowing leading-edge development and innovation to thrive in our hospitals and laboratories.

□ 1100

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF KATHY J. SACKMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in memory of Kathy J. Sackman, a pioneer in the labor movement, as well as a registered nurse and founder of the United Nurses Association of California/Union of Healthcare Professionals.

I had the honor of serving with Kathy when I was her political director for a number of years, and she was a nurse's nurse. She was a frontline nurse who worked in critical care units and saw that the adverse treatment of nurses led to worse outcomes for patients. She started in Pittsburgh and then moved to California, and she was a registered nurse in Fontana.

I asked Kathy simply one day, why did you start the United Nurses Association of California/Union of Healthcare Professionals? And she said simply, I saw that the nurses were being treated very differently, very differently than the doctors. We didn't even have dental, and they did. She said, it seemed small then, but it was something big because it represented just the fact that nurses, people that work in healthcare, didn't even get the proper benefits that they deserved. So they decided to organize.

That organization now is 32,000 strong, representing not only registered nurses but also nurse midwives. It is something that she left a living legacy that will continue for years to come.

One of the things that we tried to remind people, she told me, is that the wins that we have achieved tend to be forgotten over the years; that the pay for nurses; that the staffing ratio for nurses; that the way nurses are viewed today has always been so. And she said that that was not always the case. And that is why they fought to organize, they fought for their patients.

But she also understood that if you don't treat the nurses well, then the patients are not treated well. If you have 10 patients for one nurse, well, there is no way that those patients can get the quality care that they deserve. So she led, as well as other nurses, for the fight for staffing ratios in California that have improved the outcomes for patients across not only southern California, where she started the Nurses Union, but throughout the entire State and the country.

One of the things that she was always proud of is that she always put members first, nurses first, the community first, the hospital first because she knew if the hospital did well, that the nurses would do well. If the nurses do well, patients do well. So this is something that was impressive.

Quick story: She reorganized a hospital, nurses at a particular hospital. And when we opened up the hospital's books, they were flat broke. Every night a creditor would swipe their bank accounts, take all the money that was owed to them, and they would never have enough money to put into patient care or to keep them whole.

So she made an agreement with the nurses; we are going to help save this hospital. She worked with the parent union of this union called AFSCME International, a Republican Member of Congress, a Democratic Senator, to get the bridge funding necessary to help that hospital stay afloat. It was a safety net hospital; and told them that once we get that hospital stabilized, their finances are better, and we can get your raise, then you will be pay more dues. At that point, they were only paying $5 in dues. That is unheard of. But that is because she knew that in the end you had to get that hospital to a place that was financially stable; that was stable for the patient; and was stable for the people that worked there.

In the end, she helped save a hospital that was in a low-income community. It was a working-class community and the community that I grew up in, Riverside, California.

She will always have a lasting legacy as long as we continue to fight for patients, for nurses, and for our communities.

Madam Speaker, I just want to also mention that she is survived by two sons, Monty and Michael, and an extended family.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, today, in recognition of Women's History Month, I rise to honor three incredible women from central Washington.

Shannon Polson of the Methow Valley became one of the first women combat pilots in the U.S. military. After graduating from the University of Alaska ROTC, she was commissioned as an Army aviator and was one of the first women to fly the Apache attack helicopter. She served two tours as an Apache platoon leader, and one as a company commander, deploying to three continents.

Kathy Bryson of Richland is the Pacific Northwest disaster response coordinator for the United Methodist Church. Kathy has provided the overall leadership for recovery from fire disasters in Okanogan and Whitman Counties over the last 2 years, as well as for the wildfire disasters in Oregon and northern California.

Kayla Barron of Richland was not only a member of the first class of women commissioned into the submarine community for the U.S. Navy as a submarine warfare officer, but is currently serving as mission specialist of the NASA SpaceX Crew-3 mission to the International Space Station. In fact, just yesterday morning, she successfully completed a spacewalk. She has accomplished much since graduating from Richland High, and you can bet that we are all rooting for her every step of the way.

These women exemplify the very best of central Washington: Service to community, determination, integrity, and grit. They have paved the way for women in our communities and across the world. Their stories are an inspiration for all of us in central Washington, and it is a privilege to honor them during Women's History Month.

CONGRATULATING JARED BALCOM

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate National Potato Council's newly elected president, and fellow central Washingtonian, Mr. Jared Balcom.

Jared is the owner of a fourth-generation potato growing and fresh packing company, Balcom & Moe, based in Pasco, Washington, so he knows firsthand the challenges our central Washington producers face and how to best address them.

I have had the pleasure of working with and getting to know Jared over the years and know that he is well-equipped to advocate for the potato farmers who provide so many jobs and boost our local economy.

Congratulations, Jared, on this new role. I look forward to continuing to work together to advance our shared goals of modernizing water infrastructure, improving trade agreements, supporting agricultural research, and fixing our agricultural labor crisis.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF CLIFTON MALM

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor one of central Washington's veterans, Clifton Malm of Omak.

Clifton served our country honorably as a helicopter pilot in Vietnam and risked his life to protect his fellow servicemembers. His courage earned him a Purple Heart which, unfortunately, he never received until just now. While it may be just a small piece of metal, it represents what I believe is the gratitude of a truly thankful Nation.

Clifton, thank you for your service and for your continued dedication to

the United States of America. Your story is a reminder to all of us of the sacrifices the men and women in our Armed Forces make every single day.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Be Thou our vision, O Lord of our hearts.
Nothing else matters to us, save that You are.
You are our best thought, by day or by night.
Waking or sleeping, Your presence our light.
Be Thou our wisdom, Yours our true word.
We ever with You, and You with us, Lord.
You and You always, first in our heart.
O, king of glory, our treasure Thou art.
In You, O Lord, is any victory won.
Rule in us, reign in us, Thy will be done.
Heart of our own hearts, whatever befall.
Still be our vision, O Ruler of all.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CROW led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING JEWISH FAMILY SERVICES

(Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize Jewish Family Services and join them in celebrating their 150th anniversary.

From their founding in 1872, Jewish Family Services has always adapted to meet the moment time and time again. They helped resettle Holocaust survivors in the wake of World War II, opened a group home for individuals with disabilities in the 1980s, and formed an employment services department in 2021.

In the last year alone, Jewish Family Services helped over 25,000 individuals stand strong against COVID–19 and even became a temporary Afghan refugee resettlement agency for Afghans looking to start new lives in the Denver metro area.

For 150 years, our community has been made a better and more inclusive place to live because of the thousands of volunteers who have pulled upon their faith to serve our community and improve the lives of others.

I congratulate and thank Jewish Family Services for their service to our community and look forward to what the next 150 years will bring.

PRESIDENT ZELENSKYY'S MESSAGE TO RUSSIAN TROOPS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, during a Monday address to the Ukrainian people, President Volodymyr Zelenskyy made a direct appeal to soldiers of Russia, asking: ''. . . why should you die?''

Zelensky said: ''We hear what you really think about this senseless war . . .'' Then telling those who surrender: ''. . . we will treat you the way people are supposed to be treated'' and ''. . . not how you are being treated in your army.''

Today, Putin declared war on the Russian people. His call for self-cleansing is a repeat of the murderous Stalinists purges leading to Soviet Socialist nonpersons who disappeared.

Today, I will be offering legislation for expedited refugee status to America for defecting members of the Duma, diplomatic personnel, and Russian Government officials.

This reinforces the bipartisan legislation for Russian military defectors for expedited refugee status to America. The defectors who turn over equipment to Ukraine will receive up to $100,000.

I also have a bill in Congress for a bust of President Zelenskyy to be placed in the U.S. Capitol.

God bless Ukraine. God save Ukraine. Long live President Volodymyr Zelenskyy.

HONORING GEORGE NETTELS

(Mr. LATURNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATURNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of George Nettels. A Pittsburg, Kansas, native and U.S. Army veteran, George attended Pittsburg High School, graduated from the University of Kansas, had a successful career in the private sector, and went on to serve as the chair of the Kansas Republican Party.

At a time when many Americans in their fifties would start to slow down, George was just speeding up. George and his wife, Josie, lived a full life of travel and adventure and raised a beautiful family. To top it all off, at the age of 84, George joined his grandson Jack in a 10,000-foot tandem jump.

Beyond teaching me important lessons about being grateful for those that help you, George has personally inspired me and many others to live a life of service to others. That is what George did. Whether it was the community of Pittsburg, southeast Kansas, the State of Kansas, or our great Nation, George put the well-being of others before himself.

INFLATION'S IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, rising gas prices and skyrocketing inflation are having major impacts on small businesses. In Hico, Texas, Mark Chapman of the Chapman Cattle Company said it best: ''We see smaller revenue and return on our products when the prices of gas increase, and it may be the death of small businesses, ranchers, and farmers, as we know it.''

Chapman Cattle Company is one of the many small businesses that are struggling to keep up with record-high gas prices due to President Biden's anti-energy agenda.

Democrats continue to ignore Main Street's plea to get gas prices down and inflation under control. Small businesses weathered tough economic conditions throughout the pandemic only to be met with Biden's Green New Deal agenda that threatens everybody in all communities forever.

I will continue to fight for small businesses, work to get the government out of our lives, and let the free market compete and do great things.

In God we trust.

RECOGNIZING DR. GREGORY WILLIAMS

(Mr. PFLUGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a dedicated leader in the Permian Basin, Odessa College president Dr. Gregory Williams.

Dr. Williams began his educational career in 1983 as a student at Odessa College, later attending the University

of Texas Permian Basin, then earning his doctorate in higher education from Baylor University. In 2007, Dr. Williams returned to the Permian Basin to serve as president of Odessa College.

His impressive career has garnered local, State, and national attention. As both the chairman of the Texas Association of Community Colleges and as a member of the board of directors and the executive board of the American Association of Community Colleges, he continuously dedicates his time for the advocacy of community colleges and underrepresented communities.

Thanks to Dr. Williams' stewardship, Odessa College has become one of the most impactful educational institutions in the Nation. Not only did his leadership earn Odessa College national recognition as a top-ranked community college, but his tenure as president saw enrollment increase by 35 percent and the number of degrees awarded by an incredible 197 percent.

I thank my colleague from Illinois for also representing the achievements of Dr. Williams. He is a fierce advocate of community colleges. I speak for the entire community in sincerely thanking Dr. Williams for his commitment to the Permian Basin and to higher education.

ENDING MASK MANDATES ON PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

(Mr. HUIZENGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to demand a vote on H.J. Res. 72, a Congressional Review Act resolution that would end the CDC's mask mandate for airlines, trains, buses, and other public transportation hubs.

Tuesday night, the Senate voted in a rare bipartisan manner to end these mandates in what even CNN called a ''bipartisan rebuke of Biden administration policy.''

States and cities, big and small, across the country have ended or are in the process of ending their mask mandates at schools, basketball games, and even crowded restaurants.

Thousands of fans will pack arenas in the coming days to cheer on their teams during March Madness. At these games, they rightly won't be required to wear a mask. But as soon as they step onto a plane, a bus, a train, or even a metro, unelected bureaucrats, at the direction of President Biden, have decreed that masks must be put on and must be worn.

It is past time for this unscientific mask mandate to end. I am calling on Speaker PELOSI to hold a vote on repealing this mask mandate. Americans want their lives back, and it is time to vote.

FOCUS ON AMERICA FIRST

(Mrs. GREENE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the House to discuss why we need to focus on our country first. We are seeing rapidly rising inflation. It is completely out of control.

While here in Congress and in the Washington bubble, which is disconnected with the rest of America, all we are hearing is potential war with Russia over the country of Ukraine. Ukraine is not a NATO member ally, and President Biden had told them that we would be only standing with our NATO member allies.

All we are hearing on the news is Ukraine. Yet, here in America, what real Americans care about are gas prices they can't afford, inflation that goes up and up to where grocery bills are unaffordable, and they are very concerned about our out-of-control, open border.

Crime is out of control, yet Washington is completely disconnected and seems to care more about sending our sons and daughters to a potential war where they do not belong.

I urge my colleagues here in Congress, instead of working on a future COVID bill, spending billions of dollars on COVID that doesn't exist, let's care about our border and let's care about working to have energy independence to lower gas prices for Americans.

CONGRATULATING THE BELLARMINE KNIGHTS

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the best college basketball team not in a bracket this weekend. The Bellarmine Knights did what no team has done before, winning a Division I championship just 2 years removed from Division II, a title that should come with a big dance invitation.

Instead, this Cinderella story was cut short by an NCAA which, as it often does, played wicked stepmother, upholding a bizarre rule preventing teams elevating too quickly from Division II to championship contender.

Who they think they are serving, I don't know, but they cannot take away the Knights' extraordinary achievements or the pride they brought their school and hometown. They entered the season as afterthoughts and finished as ASUN champions and just the tenth team since 2007 to win 20 games against a top-5 schedule.

This incredible feat for the players is a triumph for Coach Scotty Davenport, who has won championships in Louisville for 35 years at every level and seems like he could for 35 more.

Scotty noted that each season ends with just two teams left standing, the NCAA and NIT champs. This year, the season ends with three. Please join me in honoring the Bellarmine Knights, the first NCAA team to finish this basketball season as champions.

□ 1215

FORCED ARBITRATION INJUSTICE REPEAL ACT OF 2022

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 979, I call up the bill (H.R. 963) to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 979, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–34 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 963

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal Act of 2022'' or the ''FAIR Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) prohibit predispute arbitration agreements that force arbitration of future employment, consumer, antitrust, or civil rights disputes; and

(2) prohibit agreements and practices that interfere with the right of individuals, workers, and small businesses to participate in a joint, class, or collective action related to an employment, consumer, antitrust, or civil rights dispute.

SEC. 3. ARBITRATION OF EMPLOYMENT, CONSUMER, ANTITRUST, AND CIVIL RIGHTS DISPUTES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 9 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

''CHAPTER 5—ARBITRATION OF EMPLOYMENT, CONSUMER, ANTITRUST, AND CIVIL RIGHTS DISPUTES

''Sec.
''501. Definitions.
''502. No validity or enforceability.

''§ 501. Definitions

''In this chapter—

''(1) the term 'antitrust dispute' means a dispute—

''(A) arising from an alleged violation of the antitrust laws (as defined in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act) or State antitrust laws; and

''(B) in which the plaintiffs seek certification as a class under rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or a comparable rule or provision of State law;

''(2) the term 'civil rights dispute' means a dispute—

''(A) arising from an alleged violation of—

''(i) the Constitution of the United States or the constitution of a State;

''(ii) any Federal, State, or local law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, age, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, religion, national origin, or any legally protected status in education, employment, credit, housing, public accommodations and facilities, voting, veterans or servicemembers, health care, or a program funded or conducted by the Federal Government or State government, including any law referred to or described in section 62(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, including parts of such law not explicitly referenced in such section but that relate to protecting individuals on any such basis; and

''(B) in which at least one party alleging a violation described in subparagraph (A) is one or more individuals (or their authorized representative), including one or more individuals seeking certification as a class under rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or a comparable rule or provision of State law;

''(3) the term 'consumer dispute' means a dispute between—

''(A) one or more individuals who seek or acquire real or personal property, services (including services related to digital technology), securities or other investments, money, or credit for personal, family, or household purposes including an individual or individuals who seek certification as a class under rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or a comparable rule or provision of State law; and

''(B)(i) the seller or provider of such property, services, securities or other investments, money, or credit; or

''(ii) a third party involved in the selling, providing of, payment for, receipt or use of information about, or other relationship to any such property, services, securities or other investments, money, or credit;

''(4) the term 'employment dispute' means a dispute between one or more individuals (or their authorized representative) and a person arising out of or related to the work relationship or prospective work relationship between them, including a dispute regarding the terms of or payment for, advertising of, recruiting for, referring of, arranging for, or discipline or discharge in connection with, such work, regardless of whether the individual is or would be classified as an employee or an independent contractor with respect to such work, and including a dispute arising under any law referred to or described in section 62(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, including parts of such law not explicitly referenced in such section but that relate to protecting individuals on any such basis, and including a dispute in which an individual or individuals seek certification as a class under rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or as a collective action under section 16(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, or a comparable rule or provision of State law;

''(5) the term 'predispute arbitration agreement' means an agreement to arbitrate a dispute that has not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement; and

''(6) the term 'predispute joint-action waiver' means an agreement, whether or not part of a predispute arbitration agreement, that would prohibit, or waive the right of, one of the parties to the agreement to participate in a joint, class, or collective action in a judicial, arbitral, administrative, or other forum, concerning a dispute that has not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement.

''§ 502. No validity or enforceability

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no predispute arbitration agreement or predispute joint-action waiver shall be valid or enforceable with respect to an employment dispute, consumer dispute, antitrust dispute, or civil rights dispute.

''(b) APPLICABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An issue as to whether this chapter applies with respect to a dispute shall be determined under Federal law. The applicability of this chapter to an agreement to arbitrate and the validity and enforceability of an agreement to which this chapter applies shall be determined by a court, rather than an arbitrator, irrespective of whether the party resisting arbitration challenges the arbitration agreement specifically or in conjunction with other terms of the contract containing such agreement, and irrespective of whether the agreement purports to delegate such determinations to an arbitrator.

''(2) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this chapter shall apply to any arbitration provision in a contract between an employer and a labor organization or between labor organizations, except that no such arbitration provision shall have the effect of waiving the right of a worker to seek judicial enforcement of a right arising under a provision of the Constitution of the United States, a State constitution, or a Federal or State statute, or public policy arising therefrom.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title 9 of the United States Code is amended—

(A) in section 1 by striking ''of seamen,'' and all that follows through ''interstate commerce'' and inserting in its place ''of individuals, regardless of whether such individuals are designated as employees or independent contractors for other purposes'';

(B) in section 2 by striking ''chapter 4'' and inserting ''chapter 4 or 5'';

(C) in section 208 by striking ''chapter 4'' and inserting ''chapter 4 or 5''; and

(D) in section 307 by striking ''chapter 4'' and inserting ''chapter 4 or 5''.

(2) TABLE OF CHAPTERS.—The table of chapters of title 9 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

''5. Arbitration of Employment, Consumer, Antitrust, and Civil Rights Disputes ..... 501''.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this act, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to any dispute or claim that arises or accrues on or after such date.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to prohibit the use of arbitration on a voluntary basis after the dispute arises.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 117–273, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the same time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 963.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 963, the Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal Act, or the FAIR Act, is critical legislation that would restore access to justice for millions of Americans who are currently locked out of the court system and are forced to settle their disputes against companies in a private system of arbitration that is often skewed in the company's favor over the individual.

Private arbitration has been transformed, by 40 years of reckless Supreme Court decisions, from a voluntary forum for companies to resolve commercial disputes into a legal nightmare for millions of consumers, employees, and others who are forced into arbitration and are unable to enforce certain fundamental rights in court.

By burying a forced arbitration clause deep in the fine print of take-it-or-leave-it consumer and employment contracts, companies can evade the court system, where plaintiffs have far greater legal protections, and hide wrongdoing behind a one-sided process that is tilted in their favor.

For example, arbitration generally limits discovery; does not adhere to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; can prohibit class actions, which it almost always does; and deny the right of appeal. Worse yet, arbitration allows the proceedings, and often even the results, to stay secret, thereby permitting companies to avoid public scrutiny of potential misconduct.

For millions of workers and consumers, the precondition, whether they know it or not, of obtaining a basic service or product, such as a bank account, a cell phone, a credit card, or even a job, is that they must sign a nonnegotiable contract that includes a provision requiring all disputes to be resolved in private arbitration.

These take-it-or-leave-it contracts, which were once clearly disfavored under the law, now seem to have been blessed by the Supreme Court as standard operating procedure in the corporate world.

That means for millions of people, the ability to enforce consumer, labor, antitrust, and civil rights laws are subject to the whims of a private arbitrator, often selected by the companies themselves.

These private arbitrators are not required to provide plaintiffs any of the fundamental protections guaranteed in the courts, and their further employment can depend on building a good reputation with the companies that hire them. Unsurprisingly, arbitration has become a virtual get-out-of-jail-free card many companies use to circumvent the basic rights of consumers and workers.

The FAIR Act reverses this disastrous trend by prohibiting the enforcement of forced arbitration clauses in consumer, labor, antitrust, and civil rights disputes.

Importantly, this legislation does not preclude both parties from agreeing to arbitrate a claim after a dispute arises. It does, however, protect unsuspecting consumers and employees from being forced to give up their right to seek justice in court.

Last month, Congress came together in a bipartisan fashion to prohibit forced arbitration clauses in suits concerning sexual harassment and sexual assault. Watching that legislation be signed into law was a proud moment for many of us in this Chamber. This bill simply extends the same basic fairness in that bill to other workers and consumers.

That bipartisan bill, which gathered, as I recall, about 130 Republican votes, is exactly the same as this bill, only limited in its application.

Every argument for that bill is an argument for this bill. This bill simply extends the same basic fairness in that bill, as I said, to other workers and consumers.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for his leadership on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 963. There is nothing fair about the FAIR Act. The bill would undermine Americans' freedom to contract; burden the judicial system, both Federal and in all States in the country; and restrict access to justice.

This bill would ban arbitration agreements across nearly all contracts. It outlaws arbitration agreements in employment disputes, consumer disputes, antitrust disputes, and civil rights disputes. It outlaws arbitration agreements with respect to not only big, huge corporations but the most humble businesses and parties in the country, those that I served in my law practice.

Democrats propose that arbitration is bad for Americans, but it has been a fixture of our legal landscape for almost 100 years. They claim that arbitration is forced. Both of their claims are wrong.

Arbitration has many benefits. It is more efficient and faster than going to court. The rules are not nearly as arcane. Injured parties get their relief sooner, and they spend less money along the way.

Plaintiffs in employment and consumer disputes, according to studies, actually win more in arbitration than they do in court. They get more money in arbitration. They win more often in arbitration.

Democrats know that arbitration has plenty of benefits. How do you know this? Because in this very bill, Democrats have carved out their union friends from the mandates of this bill.

In other words, if the bill becomes law, powerful unions, and no one else, can still use these valuable agreements vis-a-vis individuals.

This carve-out also tells us that Democrats know there is no such thing as forced arbitration. Agreements that are truly forced are already illegal under existing law in every State in the country.

People are no more forced to agree to an arbitration provision than they are to agree to any other provision of a contract. The bill, instead, bans private parties from knowingly and willingly agreeing on a process to resolve future disputes. It tells Americans, no matter how informed or sophisticated they may be, that they can't be trusted to manage their own relationships by agreeing in advance to the means of resolution to be used in the event of a dispute.

Our Democrat colleagues seem to believe that Americans can't be trusted to think for themselves. Big Government needs to tell them what to do. Their freedom to contract should be restricted by the wisdom from Washington.

Democrats argue that this bill is no big deal because parties can still decide to use arbitration after a dispute arises, but that never happens in practice for much the same reason that many disputes go to court and are resolved outside of a jury. About 1 to 2 percent actually go all the way.

The decision to get into a lawsuit is not always purely rational, taken from all points of view, and is often affected by tempers that are different once the dispute has arisen than when the parties are considering a position of cool judgment in advance.

Their incentives change after a dispute has arisen, and people will pick a strategy to resolve that dispute at that time. They won't necessarily be looking for a process, then, that is good for both parties for many reasons.

When you are immersed in a dispute, there is also a greater chance that a lawyer that you may have retained would have an incentive to direct you in the direction of litigation rather than arbitration, and those incentives certainly won't necessarily be consistent with a faster and cheaper alternative.

Rather than helping the little guy stand up to big companies, this bill would take the option to arbitrate off the table for everybody and put more money in the pockets of trial lawyers, most especially plaintiffs' class action trial lawyers.

The bill would force more people into court. They will pay more and possibly recover less. But it would also force some people out of the justice system altogether.

Some people will be unable to pay for an expensive lawsuit, or they may have a claim so small that it is only practicable for them to bring it themselves, which arbitration facilitates.

Let's be clear, too. The surge in new lawsuits hurts employment. It hurts businesses and keeps them from being able to afford to hire more people. It will raise their costs at the worst possible time, when they are already dealing with supply chain problems and record inflation caused by failed Democrat policies, and not only by prohibiting the use of arbitration going forward but by retroactively eliminating it, rendering it null and void in millions of contracts already outstanding right now, at this point in the life of our Nation, when we have 8 percent inflation, another constraint on the supply chain imposed by Democrat policies.

Everyone should be sounding the alarm on this blatant overreach. At the end of the day, this bill curries favor with the plaintiffs' bar and union bosses, and it does so at the expense of hardworking Americans and small businesses, especially.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 963, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to correct something Mr. BISHOP said. This bill does not ban arbitration. It bans forced arbitration. It bans the practice or the enforceability of the practice of having a provision in a contract that you sign to buy anything or an employment contract where you are forced, that is there and that if you try to change it, they won't sell you the car, they won't sell you the cell phone, they won't hire you, so you have no choice, and that forced arbitration removes the constitutional right to a trial by jury.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, this morning I went to a breakfast where I heard the thoughts of Miss Sheila Bair. Miss Bair is a Republican. She describes herself as a Midwest Republican who worked on Senator Dole's staff for 8 years. She is a former assistant secretary of the Treasury and a former head of the FDIC under Republican Presidents.

She said specifically the problems with inflation in this country are worldwide. They are the supply chain, which is worldwide, caused by the pandemic in China and other problems. They are worldwide. So any more of this rhetoric about Biden and his problems with the supply chain, it is not Biden; it is a worldwide problem.

The same thing for the price of oil. Yesterday, in Judiciary Committee we heard someone say it is Biden's fault that the price of oil has gone up. The price of oil is a worldwide market. President Biden's actions do not affect the worldwide market. It is supply and demand. We need to not hear these canards.

And the same for this bill. This is, as Mr. NADLER said, forced arbitration. Mr. JOHNSON has been working on this for years, and I compliment him on his work and his success. This gives consumers a chance to get their cases heard and to get a rightful judgment, not be forced to take an arbitration that is almost always entirely pro-business.

This is the difference between Republicans and Democrats. Democrats look out for people, people who have had injustice done to them and look for a way to correct it and give them equity. Republicans look to business, who caused the harm, and try to defend them and keep their pockets full.

I support the bill. All American consumers would support the bill. I urge its passage.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The distinguished chairman of the committee offered to correct me by saying that the bill only prohibits forced arbitration, said that was a correction, as if I misspoke as to facts.

Let me read from the language of the bill: ''Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no predispute arbitration agreement or predispute joint-action waiver shall be valid or enforceable with respect to an employment dispute, consumer dispute, antitrust dispute, or civil rights dispute.''

The word ''forced'' was not in that language, Madam Speaker. It prohibits all predispute arbitration agreements and post-joint action waivers.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I thank my gracious colleague for yielding, though we do not hold the same position on this piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, when our fellow Americans get a cell phone contract, when they get cable, when they get internet, they are subject to forced arbitration. Virtually every single American lives under a forced arbitration provision today, and most do not know it.

Do we really think that people have the ability to go negotiate against AT&T or Comcast or in many cases big businesses that employ a great deal of Americans? Of course, they don't.

And so what that means is that we have a two-tier system of dispute resolution. Regular folks get to show up at Article III courts the taxpayers fund to resolve their disputes, and meanwhile oftentimes big business gets a concierge lane to be able to resolve matters in their favor and oftentimes to preclude the resolution of a matter at all.

Think about instances of wage theft where big businesses can take just a little bit of money and not pay their employees. Well, an individual employee would have a very hard time getting a lawyer and making a case on that, and so they need the class action tool to be able to get redress for their grievances. The forced arbitration provisions that impair so many of our fellow Americans limit that class action tool, and then people end up getting really screwed in the process.

I support the legislation. I am proud to be the Republican lead, and it is my belief that if Article III courts funded by the taxpayers are good enough for the rest of us, they ought to be good enough for big business. I thank the gentleman for his indulgence.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Florida, and as I suggested earlier, if the bill were a matter only of big businesses, it would be a very different bill, but just as there is no limitation to forced arbitration agreements in the language of the bill, there is no limitation to arbitration agreements entered into between little guys and big companies.

The very first appeal I ever took in a 30-year law practice in 1992 was in a case called Bennish v. North Carolina Dance Theater, in which I represented a fledgling, very-hard-pressed economically arts group in my hometown that had an employment dispute with a dancer who wanted to litigate. They had an arbitration agreement. It would have destroyed that organization financially to have to engage in extended and expensive litigation. This bill would have made the enforcement of that arbitration agreement unlawful, and it has nothing to do with big business.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 963, the FAIR Act, which prohibits the enforcement of forced arbitration clauses in consumer, employment, civil rights, and antitrust disputes.

Buried deep within the fine print of almost every contract consumers sign are clauses that deprive hardworking Americans and small businesses of their day in court when they attempt to hold corporations accountable for breaking the law.

We heard from lots of small businesses in support of this bill. No one claimed that they were required to have forced arbitration in order to remain successful. Forced arbitration protects systemic wrongdoing. Everyone is always allowed to have arbitration if they want to voluntarily once a dispute arises.

This forces people to give up their right to have their claims heard, and most Americans don't even know they have given up that right because they are forced to sign contracts, where in the fine print is a provision where you are waiving that right. When you get a phone, when you get cable, when you have internet service. This outrageous practice, as my colleague from Florida just described, is nothing short of a corporate takeover of our Nation's system of justice, and it affects almost every single American.

This private arbitration that is very expensive, that lasts a very long time also lacks the procedural safeguards of our justice system. It is not subject to oversight, it doesn't have a judge, doesn't have a jury, it is not bound by laws even passed by Congress or the States in which it occurs, but it has become a requirement of everyday life for tens of millions of consumers and workers who have to surrender their rights to hold wrongdoers accountable.

These provisions require people to give up the right to have their claims heard in a court of law and to have that remedy that will prevent the wrongdoer from continuing.

Think about someone bringing a family member or loved one into a nursing home who doesn't have the opportunity to negotiate taking out that provision because someone they love is in desperate need of care.

I will give you a real example: Someone who is defending our country; the case of Lieutenant Commander Kevin Ziober, who testified in support of the FAIR Act in the last Congress. He served in the U.S. Navy Reserves since 2008. He was activated multiple times to serve in Afghanistan and Iraq.

On the last day of his employment, they had a party for him. They had a cake in the shape of a flag; they celebrated him; and moments later he was fired. When he said to his employer, ''You can't fire me, there is a Federal statute that protects me,'' they said, ''Sorry for you, you agreed to forced arbitration. You waived away your rights in your employment contract.'' And in the fine print, sure enough, there it was.

He testified at the hearing in 2019 that his case was in arbitration 7 years later. Nothing fast about that. And sadly, he said, ''This happens every day across America, not only to servicemembers and veterans whose rights are violated, but also to working people and consumers of all backgrounds.''

The FAIR Act will ensure that what happened to Lieutenant Ziober and what happens to millions of other hardworking Americans never happens again. Let's restore justice to our justice system by getting rid of these pernicious, horrible, unfair provisions.

As I conclude, I thank Congressman JOHNSON for his extraordinary leadership. He has been fighting to try to free the hardworking Americans and consumers and people who fight for our country from the bondage of forced arbitration clauses, and finally we can do that today. Vote ''yes.'' Vote for the FAIR Act.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We still haven't heard an explanation for why this legislation deems it appropriate to eliminate arbitration for parties of all sizes. We keep hearing about the little guy versus the massive corporation.

Even in that circumstance, of course, what we may be talking about is like the case from 2011, AT&T Mobility v. Concepcion, where the issue was people in California had bought cell phones, they had been offered a free cell phone, but it wasn't made clear that they would have to pay the sales tax. So

there was a $5 claim per purchaser, and wealthy plaintiffs' class-action lawyers wanted to bring a big lawsuit. With tens of thousands of them, they might get a $5 coupon, but the lawyers would buy a new jet.

That may be in some circumstances, even the dispute with the big guy. But leave that aside. We still don't hear any explanation for why you are wiping out arbitration as a means that parties choose, even if they are on equal bargaining power.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Happy St. Patrick's Day, Madam Speaker. I just want to gently correct my colleague from North Carolina when he cited 8 percent inflation. On an annualized basis, we are seeing it being measured at 10 percent here. I can understand the Representative from Tennessee's sensitivity toward Bidenflation.

Today, we are here because the Democrats want to pass legislation that insults the intelligence of Americans. According to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the only people sophisticated enough to enter into arbitration agreements are unions, so they have exempted them from this bill. Convenient.

This legislation prohibits predispute arbitration agreements, which are a fair, efficient, and effective way for consumers, workers, and businesses to settle disputes without costly and time-consuming litigation that mainly benefits the trial bar. This bill will also deprive Americans of an effective legal option, while costing them more time and money.

Predispute arbitration agreements exist in many employment and consumer contracts today and are enforced like any other kind of contract. Arbitration is generally fair, often leads to better outcomes for workers, and does not keep claimants from simultaneously alerting the world to bad actors. Those agreements create a win-win situation for parties to contract in advance on a process for resolving future disputes.

Courts, accordingly, uphold and enforce lawful agreements to arbitrate when disputes arise between parties, an approach consistent with the fundamental principle that arbitration is a matter of contract. This policy of individuals being free to contract has arguably long been a feature of American law. Existing law also permits courts to invalidate agreements under generally applicable contract defenses, such as fraud or duress.

Some will argue that arbitration requires confidentiality. This is not true. The parties to the agreement always have a right to disclose details of the proceeding unless they have a separate confidentiality agreement. Nor does current law typically preclude a party from disclosing information obtained in the arbitration process or any resulting award. Arbitration is usually less expensive and faster than litigation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. TIFFANY. It normally minimizes hostility, is less disruptive of ongoing and future business dealings, and is often more flexible. This legislation does not favor the American consumer. The only ones favored are the unions and the trial bar. This is not right for Americans, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this un-fair act.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Judiciary Committee and a sponsor of this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time today to speak on the FAIR Act, and I ask my fellow colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

My colleagues and I on the other side of the aisle will disagree on much, but on one thing we can all agree, and that is the Constitution of the United States of America is a great document.

At the beginning of that document is the preamble, and the first 17 words of the preamble read as follows: ''We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice,'' and then it goes on. But you can see at the very top, the ideal of the Founders was to establish justice in this country.

□ 1245

So they went about the Constitution by giving power to the legislative branch in Article I, to the executive branch in Article Number II, and to the judicial branch, the Court system, to establish justice in Article III.

And then, in the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution where the Bill of Rights for we, the people, gave us our individual rights, with the exception of Amendment 10, which gives the States all powers not reserved to the Federal Government.

So the Bill of Rights, in the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution, it guarantees the right to a jury trial, a trial by a jury of one's peers for any civil case where the amount in controversy exceeds $20 or more. That is still the law in this country. That is our Constitution.

But the Supreme Court has seen fit to erode our freedoms insofar as a right to a jury trial by allowing corporations, employers, to take away that right from people. That is forced arbitration.

Gretchen Carlson, with FOX News, when she came forward with her claims that she was fired because she resisted the demands of Roger Ailes to have sex with him, and she filed a civil rights action, she was met with the bar of a forced arbitration clause in the employment agreement that she signed.

I was so happy, Madam Speaker, to attend a bill signing ceremony a couple of weeks ago at the White House where my colleague, CHERI BUSTOS' legislation, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act was signed into law.

We need to go further. We just heard, within the last couple of weeks, of former coach Brian Flores of the Miami Dolphins, who filed a lawsuit against the Miami Dolphins and a couple of other clubs, as well as the NFL, alleging that he had been discriminated against racially. He had been denied hiring opportunities and retention and compensation. He filed a complaint.

He is met by the NFL with an arbitration clause. If it is good enough for sexual assault and sexual harassment cases, constitutional rights, those rights, that same ability needs to enure to those who have been aggrieved by racial discrimination and other types of discrimination. And consumers need to be allowed to assert their Seventh Amendment right when it comes to a dispute with a shop owner or shopkeeper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. And so, what we have seen with the U.S. Supreme Court is they have allowed corporations to have rights under our Constitution. Nowhere in it is there a section for corporations.

Let's restore freedom to the people of this country as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights under the Constitution that we all live under. It is a constitutional right that, when there is a dispute, a party should be able to take that dispute to court and have a jury trial, and no forced contract should deprive that person of that constitutional right.

That is what the FAIR Act will do. It will render unenforceable, after the act is signed into law, unenforceable, any pre-dispute forced arbitration clauses in consumer agreements and in employment agreements, and also in civil rights cases, causes of action and also antitrust actions.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia suggests that this bill is about whether or not we are preserving the right to jury trial in the Constitution. But I submit, that is not really what is at stake.

The question is whether you resolve a dispute through arbitration or you go to the court system. If you go to the court system, there are innumerable paths within the court system that lead to not having your case decided by a jury.

In fact, only about 1 to 2 percent of cases end up proceeding to a determination by a jury. That means 99 or 98

out of 100 cases do not. They might be dismissed on a motion for summary judgment. They might be dismissed for failure to state a claim. There may be settlement processes that come to fruition during the course of the case.

But it is almost never true—think about that—that a case in court goes to a jury. So this notion that this bill, by eliminating the choice of arbitration, somehow preserves everybody's jury trial magically is a false choice.

And more to that point, the gentleman from Georgia, and also the chairman, in the inception, noted that we have just had a bill signing of a bill that excepts from enforceable arbitration agreements the category of sexual assault, sexual harassment. The majority of Republicans supported that.

The majority of Republicans will not support this bill because it represents the throwing out of the entire mechanism of arbitration, which has been, as I indicated, a feature of the legal landscape used with great utility and utilized throughout the last hundred years almost, since 1925.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ).

Mr. BENTZ. Madam Speaker, I move to recommit H.R. 936 and have my amendment that strikes the retroactivity provision of this bill included in the RECORD.

It is wrong, clearly not right, for Congress to step in and retroactively invalidate parts of millions of existing contracts. The parties to those contracts, in good faith, relied on those parts of their contracts when they struck their bargain. But if this bill becomes law, it will rewrite millions of existing contracts, which will lead to waves of new litigation.

This litigation will place new costs on businesses, consumers, and employees, who will be forced to pay more for lawyers, hundreds of dollars per hour and may get stuck for years in long court battles instead of having available the solution of arbitration.

Applying new laws retroactively undermines the rule of law and upends the certainty that parties are trying to create when they negotiate and enter into a contract.

My motion would make this bill apply only to agreements entered into after this bill goes into effect. I offered this amendment at the markup in the Judiciary Committee, but the Democrats there rejected it.

I offered this amendment to the Rules Committee, but the Democrats there chose not to make it in order.

I offer this amendment for a third time here on the floor of this House because this matter is critically important. Retroactively voiding millions upon millions of existing contracts is truly bad policy.

By making this bill apply only to future contracts, we can avoid the inherent unfairness of having Congress directly interfere in millions upon millions of existing agreements. I urge my colleagues to support my motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, if we adopt this motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on the Judiciary to consider again my amendment to H.R. 963 to ensure that the Democrats' attempt to eviscerate arbitration will not apply retroactively to the millions upon millions of contractual agreements already in place.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to point out that this bill does not ban arbitration. If two parties have a dispute and prefer arbitration to going to court, they can have arbitration. This bill bans forced arbitration, meaning arbitration that is entered into contracts that people have no ability to change. That is why it says predispute arbitration agreements are struck by this bill, not post-dispute arbitration agreements.

So this bill does not eliminate arbitration agreements if they want to. It does eliminate forced arbitration agreements that the party, usually the employee or the consumer had no knowledge of probably and no ability to say no to. We used to call them contracts of adhesion, but we don't do that anymore.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friends and colleagues, Chairman JOHNSON and Chairman NADLER, for this long overdue legislation that we voted on last year; and, as well, to acknowledge the forced arbitration legislation that was signed by the White House dealing with sexual assault.

Now we have come full circle, so let me try to reinforce, because our friends on the other side of the aisle—and I call them friends—not only have it wrong, they have it upside down. It is completely misconstrued as to what this legislation does.

And if you go out on the street corner and talk to any American they will say, of course I want the FAIR Act, because forced arbitration says to them that, in essence, you are obligated, you are indentured to the contract that you signed to get a job, to buy a phone, to get that big TV, and that you are not able to pursue your due process rights.

Now, this is a constitutional issue. The Fifth Amendment completely indicates that you cannot be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, however you choose your due process of law.

We go on to the 14th Amendment; of course, part of the historic 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments, and it indicates that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States under this Constitution, which includes the right to a trial by jury, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process again; and that you would guarantee equal process and justice under the law.

So let me factually say, though the signing of any contract or document is voluntary, often large corporations make it impossible to use their product or be employed without agreeing to a contract with a forced arbitration, making signing of the contract or document anything but voluntary; and clearly, it has constitutional implications.

Something that should alarm all American consumers is that according to a study commissioned by University of California Davis Law Review, 81 companies in the Fortune 100, including subsidiaries or relating affiliates, have used arbitration agreements in connection with consumer transaction.

Now let me be very clear. When you have a dispute, we are perfectly happy for you, as the individual, part of the contract, to say to the corporation, I don't care about my rights. I am going to throw myself on the mercy of arbitration. And in doing so, you may subject yourself to a limited decision, as Brian Flores was finding out.

Madam Speaker, let me tell you that American economic supremacy does not stem from the contributions of modern-day oligarchs, billionaires, CEOs, or the wealthy. It comes from the middle class. It comes from those 60 million workers and countless others who put in an honest 8-hour day, five times a week, in the simple pursuit of trying to feed their families and take care of their communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his generosity.

I oppose the upcoming amendment that talks about not excluding unions. Unions have agreements between individuals. Unions have the power, through their persons they represent, to vote yea or nay for that contract. So if they vote yea or nay on that contract, their eyes open on the arbitration, it is the union that will be protecting that individual. They will not be in that process alone.

In the instance of an individual and the contracts that are signed, they will be alone. But they will not be alone if the FAIR Act is passed and the Constitution is upheld. That is why I support enthusiastically the FAIR Act and oppose the amendment to be forthcoming.

Pass the FAIR Act because justice and the Constitution requires it.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 963, ''The FAIR Act'' which prohibits a predispute arbitration agreement from being valid or enforceable in an employment, consumer, antitrust, or civil rights dispute.

Action on this legislation is long overdue considering the long history of the problems caused by forced arbitration. The FAIR Act was passed by the House in the 116th Congress, so I hope we can pass it again now and that the Senate will do the same this time so we can finally resolve this problem.

Forced arbitration is typically due to a clause in a contract that takes away employees' and consumers' rights to pursue litigation in the case their legal rights are violated. 60 million American employees and myriad consumers are unfairly, and usually unknowingly, subjected to its limitation of their legal rights.

Though the signing of any contract or document is voluntary, often large corporations make it impossible to use their product or be employed without agreeing to a contract with a forced arbitration clause, making signing of the contract or document anything but voluntary.

Something that should alarm all American consumers is that, according to a study commissioned by the University of California Davis Law Review, 81 companies in the Fortune 100, including subsidiaries or related affiliates, have used arbitration agreements in connection with consumer transactions.

The study also found that possibly two-thirds of American households are covered by consumer based forced arbitration agreements.

This means nearly 86 million American households have their Constitutional right of access to the judicial system restricted.

For American employees, the numbers are also staggering. Similarly, 60 million American employees are subject to forced arbitration agreements of which they are often unaware until a dispute arises for which they seek judicial redress.

The extensive reach of arbitration clauses is only increasing, with the Economic Policy Institute estimating 80 percent of private sector nonunion workers being subject to forced arbitration clauses by 2024.

Madam Speaker, American economic supremacy does not stem from the contributions of modern-day oligarchs, billionaires, CEOs, or the wealthy; it comes from the middle class. It comes from those 60 million workers and countless others who put in an honest 8-hour day 5 times a week in the simple pursuit of trying to feed their families and take care of their communities.

The fact that so many of these hard-working Americans are having their legal rights taken away without them knowing it is morally reprehensible and must be put to an end. The FAIR Act remedies that 1 problem.

In addition to being sound policy, the FAIR Act promotes racial equity in our rapidly diversifying country and workforce.

Another study from the EPI found 59.1 percent of African American workers (7.5 million workers) are subject to mandatory arbitration, as are female workers (at 57.6 percent).

Unfortunately, this is not surprising considering African Americans and women are two of the most historically discriminated against groups in the United States.

Forced arbitration continues the struggles of African Americans in the workplace, from slavery, sharecropping, and redlining to ongoing segregation, discrimination, racism, and voter suppression. As these statistics show, our struggle for equity in the workplace continues.

We are exhausted, yet we remain in the fight. We must continue to set right historical wrongs, and the FAIR Act provides us an avenue to do so.

Fairness in the workplace for women is also further remediated by this legislation. In this country, we have a disgraceful wage gap between men and women of 82 cents to the dollar, according to the latest Bureau of Labor Statistics figures.

As a Member of the Women's Caucus, I have been fighting for pay equity for American women since before I arrived here as a Representative in 1995, and I believe that equal pay for equal work is a simple matter of justice.

Wage disparities are not simply a result of women's education levels or life choices. In fact, the pay gap between college educated men and women starts as soon as they enter the workplace and expands shortly thereafter. Women can have the same background, work in the same field, and perform the same functional position, yet still be grossly underpaid. Disproportionately subjecting women to forced arbitration is yet another stain on this country's historical attitude towards women in the workforce.

I have consistently been a proud sponsor and cosponsor of legislation that expands legal rights, creates a more level playing field, and erodes long standing social disparities.

The FAIR Act achieves these goals, and I therefore urge my colleagues to support the FAIR Act.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On the other side of the aisle, we hear repeated references to defending the Constitution and the American way. I would remind the Chamber that our economy, the American economy, is built on contracts; which contracts, under the rule of law, are not forced, but enforced when someone refuses to abide by his or her agreement. That is not forced. That is where a contract is enforced.

We, our courts, our judicial system, and, yes, arbitration is the means by which we call people to live by their bargains, and that has been the key to the most successful economy in the history of the world. It has certainly been the state of affairs, as I said, for almost 100 years.

Throwing that out, dispensing with a major component of that on the premise that you are pursuing the American system is contrary to fact. It is, as Democrats often seek to do, it is transformational. It seeks to transform America, not to reinforce and persist it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

□ 1300

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely right. The bill purports to assert a very important constitutional right, the right to trial by jury in civil actions. But it does so by denying everyone a very important other constitutional right, the freedom of unimpaired contract, the right of two parties to agree to exchange goods and services according to their own best judgment.

Now, because of the excesses and expenses and uncertainties that have plagued our civil courts, many consumers and producers, and many employees and employers, find it advantageous to waive their right to civil jury trials in any disputes between them in favor of a simpler, cheaper, and faster arbitration.

Now, proponents tell us it is an uneven playing field, and this requirement is often imposed in nonnegotiable, take-it-or-leave-it propositions. This isn't exactly true. Every employee and every consumer, no matter how weak and vulnerable, has an absolute defense against a bad agreement. It is the word ''no.'' No, the pay isn't good enough. No, the price is too high. No, I don't like the binding arbitration clause or any other terms, and I am taking my business elsewhere.

Now, even when there aren't good alternatives, the fact is that every provision in a contract is a take-it-or-leave-it proposition if one side or the other insists on it. The question for each side is whether the totality of the contract is beneficial to them or not. It is every grownup's right to make that decision for themselves without somebody in government making it for them.

Remember, the so-called forced arbitration provision forces the company to accept arbitration as well. For example, I am not a lawyer. I can't afford to hire one to take a big company to court. For me, binding arbitration helps level the playing field by providing me with an inexpensive alternative that the company must abide by. This bill takes that protection away from me.

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, through arbitration, employees prevail three times more often, recover twice as much money, and resolve their claims more quickly than they could through litigation. And in most cases, the employer pays the entire cost of arbitration.

According to one study, in claims between $10,000 and $75,000, the consumer claimant was charged an average of $219. Now, you compare that to the cost of hiring an attorney and taking on an entire corporate legal department.

The net result of this bill will be higher prices for products and lower wages for workers as companies factor the high cost of litigation into their business models.

Madam Speaker, that is not fair.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks.

It causes me to remark, as the gentleman from Tennessee said a moment ago, that it is Democrats who look out for the interests of the little guy and look out for the interests of the people. I wonder why it is that looking out for the interests of the people invariably involves restricting their freedom in some way. What a remarkable notion.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal Act.

Forced arbitration deprives workers of the choice to have their day in court. When companies impose forced arbitration clauses, they choose every aspect of the process. They choose the mediator; they choose the location; and they choose the terms of the relief.

This is a lose-lose scenario, and it disproportionately harms workers, particularly women and communities of color, but it imposes enormous consequences for everyone.

You sign a contract for car repair, for car rental, for any consumer transaction, and when you need that car rental, hidden in those contracts is a prohibition from you taking any claim to court. No choice, no notion, even, for the majority of people that this fundamental right to that choice to sue an unscrupulous corporation is being taken away from you when you sign that contract.

Madam Speaker, I think of this bill as a bill for the little guy or the little woman. Women and people of color forced into arbitration face mostly White male arbitrators in environments that heavily favor corporate interests.

When musician Jay-Z entered arbitration without a single Black arbitrator in the room, he asked for ''neutrals of color.'' But only three suggested alternatives were Black, one of whom was a partner at the law firm representing the opposing party.

Eliminating forced arbitration would open the courthouse doors for women, for workers of color, for poor folks across this country, advancing social equity and aiding the fight against discrimination. But it is also the right thing for every single consumer to be able to pursue this right to a day in court.

Just last week, President Biden signed into law my bill with Representative CHERI BUSTOS to ban forced arbitration in cases of sexual harassment and sexual assault. That will protect the right of 60 million workers to a fair day in court. And that is just the people who are subject to employment contracts.

On top of that, it will apply, and it will apply retroactively, to all the contracts around sexual assault and sexual harassment. That is huge progress.

What is good enough in cases of sexual assault and sexual harassment—and that bill passed in a bipartisan and bicameral way—is good enough for all workers.

It is time to take the next step by passing this bill to extend these protections to a fair day in court across the board.

Again, we emphasize that if somebody wants arbitration, it doesn't stop that route, but it does say you can't be forced only into this and into denying your day in court.

Now, let's also be clear that the FAIR Act is carefully crafted to protect unions. It preserves essential union bargaining power while creating freedoms for nonunionized workers. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have introduced an amendment that would undermine that power. This cannot happen. We cannot allow our Republican colleagues to undermine unions and the foundation of our middle class.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the FAIR Act, and I thank Congressman HANK JOHNSON for his leadership.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that we have heard repeated a number of times, as the gentleman from Rhode Island suggested and the gentlewoman from Washington just said, is that if you go to arbitration, the company picks the arbitrators, and that is it. That is not, in fact, correct.

Courts police the fundamental fairness of the arbitration process. If there is a process that is fundamentally unfair, the courts will modify it until it is fair. So, that is a misconception.

Furthermore, it has also been suggested that it is by the whim of the arbitrator what the result is. That is exactly what Mr. CICILLINE, I believe, said. That also is erroneous.

If an arbitrator writes a decision that manifests a disregard of the governing law, like the soldier who had been in arbitration for 8 years that he suggested, the courts will vacate, strike down, that arbitration award.

It is important to know those premises before you decide what to do on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 963.

H.R. 963 undermines freedom of contract as well as consumer choice by banning informed, consenting adults from freely entering into contracts to arbitrate disputes.

Arbitration generally works well and is a fair and effective way to resolve disputes. While civil litigation can be long, complex, and costly, arbitration provides a cheaper and efficient process to resolve disputes in a timely manner.

Banning predispute arbitration agreements would mean Americans spend more time in court with no guarantee of better outcomes. Banning arbitration agreements during a time of significant inflation and in the middle of a supply chain crisis will effectively lower Americans' income.

While larger companies may be able to deal with the expense of a slew of new lawsuits, this change will cause harm to smaller businesses that may not survive lengthy and costly litigation battles.

Because postdispute arbitrations are rare, banning arbitration agreements will flood the court system. For one thing, some claims that are addressed through arbitration now may be individualized, making them unsuitable for class treatment.

Even where claims can't be combined, a plaintiff may still be worse off as a class member than he would be with the claim in arbitration. This is because the benefits of arbitration, particularly lower litigation costs, coincide with lower revenue for others, such as trial lawyers.

Banning certain predispute arbitration clauses and similar policy will benefit trial lawyers, not necessarily consumers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise as someone who in my past life defended corporations and entities that often had mandatory arbitration clauses in their contracts. As such, I am uniquely qualified to address the myths that have been perpetuated about the FAIR Act. By the way, ''myths'' is a polite term for ''lies.''

One has to consider that if we believe these claims that forced arbitration is cheaper, fairer, and faster, then surely workers and consumers would voluntarily choose it. So, there is no harm in restoring Americans' freedom to choose for themselves how to seek justice.

First myth: The FAIR Act eliminates arbitration entirely, and no one will choose arbitration if it is voluntary.

Fact: The FAIR Act doesn't eliminate arbitration, as has been said over and over here today. It just prohibits forced arbitration and allows both parties to choose arbitration voluntarily after a worker's rights or a consumer's rights have been violated.

If forced arbitration were instead voluntary, the private market would incentivize arbitration providers to treat both parties fairly and equally so that both parties would choose that process because they would feel like they are getting an equal opportunity at justice.

Second myth: Consumers and workers are more likely to win and get higher awards in forced arbitration than in court.

Fact: This is a lie. That is the result of a misleading study, which deliberately cherry-picked data by excluding all results for the most common way consumers and workers file their cases in State courts and through class actions.

The Chamber of Commerce only examined outcomes of individual cases filed in Federal court because it knows that very few consumer and worker cases are filed in Federal court. Americans are, in fact, more likely to be struck by lightning than they are to win a monetary award in a forced arbitration.

A study based on self-reported data from two of the leading private arbitration providers revealed that, on average, only approximately 382 consumers won a monetary award each year, less than the number of people struck by lightning every year in the United States. While an estimated 60 million workers are subject to forced arbitration clauses, only 82 prevailed in employment forced arbitration claims in 2020.

Third myth: Forced arbitration is faster and, as we have heard from some people across the aisle, cheaper than litigation.

Another completely false claim is based on faulty data from a forced arbitration database, which systematically deleted older cases, completely skewing the average length of a case in forced arbitration—simple data manipulation.

The idea that arbitration would provide consumers a cheaper way to litigate their claims, perhaps suggesting that they would do that without a lawyer, no major company will ever go to arbitration without their highly paid company lawyers. And every individual, whether they are in court or in arbitration, would need representation against a corporation regardless of the forum that they are in.

Fourth myth: The court system is overbooked, so forced arbitration provides more flexibility for scheduling.

While more powerful defendants have an incentive to drag out resolution of a case, that incentive exists whether they are in court or arbitration.

□ 1315

It is in the best interest of the individual who is filing the claim to seek the fastest possible resolution for his or her claim, and that would be done regardless of which they choose.

By the way, corporations often choose courts over arbitration to resolve disputes that they initiate, showing that they do so when it benefits them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, myth number 5, the FAIR Act violates the freedom to contract. This is my favorite one. Whose freedom? That of corporations or Americans? There was a comment that we are in the most successful economy in the history of the world, but for whom? Not necessarily for consumers or workers.

Don't Americans have the right to participate in the economy without being forced to forego the rights and protections that are afforded to them under the law? The United States Constitution's Seventh Amendment guarantees the right to trial by jury for every American.

What if corporations inserted provisions into their contracts forcing Americans to give up their First or Second Amendment rights to get or keep a job? Would we still be talking about the freedom to contract?

Finally, the last myth. The FAIR Act is retroactive. It is not retroactive. It only applies to cases filed on or after the date of enactment. We need a level playing field between corporations and industries and the people who find themselves aggrieved by them. The arbitration process—make no mistake about it—is a private process. People bringing their claims need to be able to fairly evaluate the best forum for that claim to be adjudicated.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of ending the use of forced arbitration and to restore the right of millions of Americans to their day in court. I think my colleagues have done a really good job on this side of the aisle in explaining why this is so important for basic rights of all Americans.

Madam Speaker, I want to tell you a couple things that have happened in Illinois. I deal a lot with older Americans in my district—as I am sure many of you hear from senior citizens—and I have heard these really horrific stories from families who discover that in nursing homes that their loved ones have been neglected or abused or even worse.

These families want to do something about it. They want to hold these nursing homes accountable, and then they find out that they have quite inadvertently, quite unknowingly have signed a forced arbitration agreement.

Picture these moments. These are people who are often in very emotional situations. They are bringing their loved ones to a nursing home. This is never an easy situation. The last thing they are thinking about, among all the paperwork that is put before them, that they have signed away their rights. And then they find out that something has happened to their loved one in a nursing home and they are left without the recourse that they need.

We have too often seen corporations who are virtually immune from the kind of accountability that they should be held to. I think the time is up right now. If it is good enough for sexual harassment and abuse, it is certainly good enough for people in nursing homes that have been abused and that their families have their day in court.

Madam Speaker, I support the FAIR Act.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I was intrigued by the situation we just had on the floor, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, I think she said she represented big corporations. Yet, she spoke to the fundamental unfairness of arbitration. It is ironic perhaps.

I spent almost 30 years—29 years in the practice of law as a litigator representing people in court and in arbitration equally. I represented plaintiffs and defendants both, frequently individuals, often businesses, always small to medium-sized businesses, and occasionally a local government or two, never a big company.

I have had clients who didn't want to have arbitration agreements enforced and sometimes I could defeat them or have them modified or change the results of them because the arbitrator had manifested disregard for the law. Sometimes I had clients who wanted to enforce those agreements. It depends on the circumstances.

But I can tell you it is not a tool that is uniformly bad. Although I have voted for accepting enforceable arbitration agreements, arbitration clauses involving sexual harassment and sexual assault cases, I don't believe that throwing the baby out with the bath water is a good idea. It is a terrible idea.

Let me let America in on the inside scoop. Here is what this is about. For the past, roughly, decade there have been a series of cases in the United States Supreme Court in which, through various efforts and methods, plaintiffs' class action lawyers, lawyers for big class litigation where they make millions and millions in fees, have tried various approaches to get the United States Supreme Court to allow class actions to be pursued through arbitration, and they have failed. That is why this bill is here.

The bill is to reverse the result of that decade of litigation in the Supreme Court in order for class action lawyers to be able to have a field day and to make a lot of money. This bill protects and seeks the fortune of plaintiffs' class action lawyers, and of course, it protects the patronage of big unions both at the same time. That is what the bill is about.

Madam Speaker, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, in today's economy, signing up for digital services often requires us to agree to lengthy terms and conditions that many users likely ignore and then

unknowingly sign away certain rights such as filing a lawsuit or joining a class action. The Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal (FAIR) Act addresses this rampant abuse of our legal system by banning mandatory pre-dispute arbitration clauses in employment, consumer, and civil rights cases.

These forced arbitration clauses are increasingly found in consumer contracts, requiring users to waive their right to sue in a court of law and instead resolve any disputes through arbitration. Because arbitration is secretive, lacks important due process protections, and produces decisions that cannot be appealed, it too often shields bad actors from accountability and prevents consumers from enforcing their rights in our justice system.

Many consumer contracts that include forced arbitration clauses empower companies to collect unseemly amounts of data from their users and abuse that data for profit. The problem is acute in highly concentrated industries where corporations wield significant market power because consumers often have little or no alternative to these anti-consumers contracts. This model of what's been labeled "surveillance capitalism" is bolstered by forced arbitration clauses that ensure the most egregious abuses of consumer data cannot be challenged in court. My legislation to protect consumer privacy, the Online Privacy Act, bars the use of forced arbitration clauses in user agreements about privacy for this reason.

No one should be required to sign away their right to access our justice system when they sign up for a credit card, cell phone plan, or social media account. The FAIR Act is critical legislation to protect the rights of consumers, particularly regarding online privacy. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. FITZGERALD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 117–273.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, strike lines 16 through 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 979, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, instead of setting one standard and having everyone play by the same rules, the Democrats have singled out the unions for favorable treatment.

This legislation bans predispute arbitration for nonunion employees while preserving these benefits for union employees. This discrepancy makes no sense and, unfortunately, smacks of political favoritism.

Arbitration offers a faster and cheaper path to resolution of a dispute. Taking this path away from nonunion employees leaves these workers to the mercy of—like we said earlier—the high-priced trial lawyers, while union workers maintain the benefit of arbitration.

My amendment would remove this carve-out for union employees and restore parity between union and nonunion workers.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle already shut down my amendment to limit attorneys' fees to a reasonable amount so that consumers are protected. I am disappointed by that. They also rejected my amendment to reduce the cost of this bill by exempting contracts for critical supplies that have been affected by the Biden administration's supply chain crisis.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to protect workers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which would significantly weaken this legislation and damage the collective bargaining process for tens of millions of working Americans.

We have said it over and over again today—this bill is not designed to eliminate arbitration. While my Republican colleagues would like you to believe that the FAIR Act will end arbitration entirely, that is simply not true.

The FAIR Act would put an end to forced arbitration—arbitration that is not willingly agreed to by both sides, which is a predatory one-sided practice created by and for huge corporations to allow them to get away with abusive conduct. It is a system that can exist only when these companies can take advantage of a stark power imbalance between themselves and workers, consumers, and small businesses.

Labor unions correct that power imbalance. The collective bargaining process provides real protections that are unavailable to nonunion workers by forcing big businesses to compromise with skilled negotiators focused on improving terms for their workers.

Collective bargaining guarantees other important protections in the arbitration process, such as truly neutral arbitrators, better procedures, transparent decisionmaking, and the option to appeal decisions. It creates a system that can actually resolve disputes quickly, efficiently—and most important—fairly for all parties involved.

That is not forced arbitration precisely because it is truly voluntary. Arbitration only works when two parties of equal bargaining power can negotiate terms that work for everyone involved, which is exactly what happens when a labor union and a corporation establish a collective bargaining agreement.

That is completely different than forced arbitration of nonunion employment disputes where an employee is forced to accept an arbitration clause that is buried deep inside the fine print of a stack of confusing paperwork on a take-it-or-leave-it basis that they must sign to get a job.

The big corporations love this system because it forces their workers, it forces employees, it forces the purchasers of products to go to forced arbitration, and that is an inherently skewed process. That is why the employee loses 98 percent of the forced arbitrations. The employer wins 98 percent of the forced arbitrations. That is not a fair process.

Moreover, as my colleague, Congressman PERLMUTTER, made clear during the Rules Committee meeting on this bill, nothing in the FAIR Act prevents individual workers from deciding to vindicate their rights before a jury.

As the plain language of the bill states, no collectively bargained arbitration provision ''shall have the effect of waiving the right of a worker to seek judicial enforcement of a right arising under a provision of the Constitution of the United States, a State constitution, or a Federal or State statute, or public policy arising therefrom.''

In other words, this amendment is a solution in search of a problem that could upend the rights of millions of workers today. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, to vote for the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I inform the gentleman from New York that we have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the FAIR Act. I have heard some of the debate in this Chamber today, and as a litigator, I disagree.

The FAIR Act is about restoring justice for the American people. It is for consumers, it for workers, it is for small business people, it is for people whose civil rights have been violated, it is for millions of Americans who are denied their right to seek justice and accountability because of forced arbitration.

There is certainly a role for arbitration of disputes and other forms of alternative dispute resolution in our system of justice. I know this from my own experience representing individuals and organizations in the courts and before arbitrators.

The FAIR Act is important because it recognizes the role arbitration can play in resolving disputes between willing parties while it recognizes the fundamental rights of the people who have

been subjected to arbitration agreements without their true consent.

The FAIR Act protects the freedom to contract, the freedom of choice, and the freedom granted in our Constitution, including the Seventh Amendment.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

□ 1330

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I would simply urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, there are over 60 million workers—a majority of non-union private-sector employees—who are subject to forced arbitration clauses. According to the Economic Policy Institute, that number will be over 80 million by 2024. Those employees are told that if they want to get a job or keep their current job they must sign away their right to their day in court and submit to a forced arbitration agreement. In most cases they do not have a choice.

When these workers seek to hold their employers to account for wage theft, civil rights abuses, or racial discrimination, they are shoved into a secretive arbitration process designed by corporations with almost unlimited resources, and they lose 98 percent of the time. That is what the FAIR Act will fix. This legislation will restore these workers' access to our justice system and guarantee their constitutional rights by ending forced arbitration.

This amendment would do nothing to protect workers while undermining this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this unnecessary and harmful amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 963 is postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

EXPRESSING THE HOPE FOR JUSTICE FOR THE VICTIMS OF BLOODY SUNDAY

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 888) expressing the hope for justice for the victims of Bloody Sunday, one of the most tragic of days during the Troubles, on its 50th anniversary as well as acknowledging the progress made in fostering peace in Northern Ireland and on the island of Ireland in recent decades, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 888

Whereas on January 30, 1972, 26 unarmed civilians were shot by British soldiers during a protest that began peacefully in Derry, resulting in the death of 14 individuals in a massacre now known as Bloody Sunday;

Whereas as a result of the soldiers' unjustifiable use of force, the individuals known as John ''Jackie'' Duddy, Patrick ''Paddy'' Doherty, Bernard ''Barney'' McGuigan, Hugh Gilmour, Kevin McElhinney, Michael Kelly, John Young, William Nash, Michael McDaid, James Wray, Gerald Donaghy, Gerard McKinney, William McKinney, and John Johnston tragically lost their lives;

Whereas Bloody Sunday was one of the most significant and deadly injustices to take place during the Troubles, and exacerbated the conflict in Northern Ireland;

Whereas none of those shot by British Army soldiers posed a threat of causing death or serious injury, or were doing anything else that could justify their shooting;

Whereas the families of the victims of Bloody Sunday were denied for decades an honest and comprehensive assessment of the events that took place on Bloody Sunday;

Whereas in 1998, after campaigns from the families of those injured and killed on Bloody Sunday, a second inquiry was established by the Government of the United Kingdom;

Whereas this second Bloody Sunday Inquiry found that the shootings that took place on Bloody Sunday were the result of wrongful actions taken by British soldiers;

Whereas on June 15, 2010, then-Prime Minister David Cameron while addressing the House of Commons apologized on behalf of the Government of the United Kingdom saying that the events that took place on Bloody Sunday were ''unjustified'', ''unjustifiable'', and ''wrong'';

Whereas despite these findings and acknowledgment made by the Government of the United Kingdom, none of the individuals involved in the unlawful use of force that led to the murder of 14 innocent civilians on Bloody Sunday have been held accountable;

Whereas the lack of accountability and justice provided to those who perished from the unlawful use of force on Bloody Sunday both erodes trust and is dangerous;

Whereas accountability and justice for the victims of Bloody Sunday, along with all victims of the Troubles, would represent a step towards addressing Northern Ireland's legacy of violence and promote reconciliation;

Whereas an environment which fosters accountability and justice for the events of the Troubles must be established by the Government of the United Kingdom and maintained;

Whereas the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement with a devolved government in Northern Ireland as well as healthy ''north-south'' and ''east-west'' relations provides appropriate, useful, and productive avenues for discussion and negotiation to prevent violence, uphold peace, maintain stability, and promote the interests of all parties and communities involved;

Whereas the avoidance of a hard border on the island of Ireland is essential for maintaining the peace resulting from the Good Friday Agreement;

Whereas the full implementation of the Northern Ireland Protocol as agreed upon as part of the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the European Union will assist in preserving peace and stability on the island of Ireland;

Whereas while progress has been made in fostering peace in Northern Ireland and on the island of Ireland in recent decades, it is in the interest of all parties to foster intercommunity discussions and relations as well as integration in civil and societal structures to promote communication and mutual understanding; and

Whereas on January 30, 2022, peace activists, concerned individuals, and the descendants of those lost to this violence gathered in Derry to mourn, to stand in solidarity with victims' families in their search for justice, and re-commit themselves to the peace process established by the Good Friday Agreement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the violence and killing of 14 individuals on Bloody Sunday 50 years ago and supports justice for the victims and their families;

(2) calls on all parties to take meaningful steps toward peace and reconciliation and to ensure justice for victims of the Bloody Sunday massacre as well as all those affected by the Troubles by supporting dialogue and negotiation between all parties;

(3) urges the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement to ensure peace and stability on the island of Ireland;

(4) recognizes the findings of the Bloody Sunday Inquiry, also known as the Saville Inquiry, and calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to support prosecutions of individuals who committed unjustifiable crimes on Bloody Sunday based on the evidence collected;

(5) opposes any proposal by the Government of the United Kingdom to implement amnesty or statute of limitation laws that would end or inhibit investigations and prosecutions of crimes committed during the Troubles, including on Bloody Sunday;

(6) calls upon the involved parties to facilitate the implementation of the Northern Ireland Protocol in the interest of maintaining peace and stability on the island of Ireland;

(7) urges the European Union, including the Republic of Ireland, and the United Kingdom to act in good faith with regard to negotiations around Brexit and implementation of the Northern Ireland Protocol;

(8) calls on the people of Northern Ireland to foster further integration across communities and break down cultural, religious, and societal barriers that remain;

(9) supports the devolved government of Northern Ireland and recognizes the devolved government as a successful outcome and tenet of the Good Friday Agreement; and

(10) supports the continued strong governmental, societal, and cultural relationships between the peoples of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Republic of Ireland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Res. 888, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my resolution expressing the hope for justice for the victims of Bloody Sunday, one of the most tragic days of the Troubles, a violent time which lasted 30 years from approximately 1968 to 1998.

This resolution acknowledges the progress made in fostering peace on the island of Ireland in recent decades and calls on all parties to come together to ensure full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement.

This resolution comes at an important time during the 50th-year anniversary of the massacre and on St. Patrick's Day, a day where people of Irish descent around the world remember our roots and celebrate our history. I am proud the resolution is moving forward on this day of all days.

First, I thank many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their sponsorship of this resolution. To the original cosponsors—Representatives RICHIE NEAL, MIKE KELLY, BRIAN FITZPATRICK, DAVID CICILLINE, JIM MCGOVERN, NICOLE MALLIOTAKIS, GERRY CONNOLLY, JUAN VARGAS, and TOM SUOZZI—and almost 40 other cosponsors, I am grateful for their support and for their longstanding work on this issue.

I also express my deepest gratitude to Chair MEEKS, Ranking Member MCCAUL, Leader HOYER, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee staff for their support of this resolution.

As a member and as a former chair of the Europe, Energy, the Environment and Cyber Subcommittee himself, Chair MEEKS understands firsthand the importance of peace and stability on the island of Ireland.

I introduced this resolution to honor the lives lost during Bloody Sunday, a singular day amidst a long period of struggle that exacerbated the conflict in Northern Ireland.

On January 30, 1972, I was a college student in Boston, a city known for its deep connection to Irish-American culture. I vividly recall the images and displays of unbridled violence during a peaceful protest in Derry that reverberated throughout the world. Even today, I remain deeply affected by the actions of British soldiers that led to the wounding of 26 unarmed civilians and the death of 14 individuals.

On January 30, 2022, as 50 years had passed, I expressed to the families of the victims my firm belief that Bloody Sunday represents one of the deadliest injustices to take place during the Troubles. I underline that as we continue to mourn the loss of those who perished that day, we must also advocate for justice while taking the necessary steps to build a more peaceful future.

As I expressed to the families, accountability and justice for the events of Bloody Sunday must be achieved to ensure a long-lasting peace on the island of Ireland. While it has long been acknowledged that British soldiers were directly responsible for the murder of civilians on Bloody Sunday, those who suffered under this unlawful use of force continue to be denied an honest assessment of the events that took place in 1972. To date, not one of the individuals involved has been held accountable for their actions.

I want to state clearly: amnesty proposals by the government of the United Kingdom are disrespectful and deny due process to Bloody Sunday victims and their families. They run counter to the spirit of remarks of then-Prime Minister David Cameron who termed the events as unjustifiable and wrong. The evidence is clear: The individuals responsible for the violence that took place on that fateful day must be brought to justice.

Along with the avoidance of a hard border, these legacy issues remain as threats to and unfinished business of the Good Friday Agreement, an agreement few thought would ever occur. Both sides compromised. Its improbable success of diplomacy over violence inspires us today as Europe and the world face its greatest conflict in 80 years.

On St. Patrick's Day we take pride in the indispensable role the United States has played in forging the Good Friday Agreement. The Clinton Administration and congressional leaders worked tirelessly over two decades ago to implement the Good Friday Agreement and achieve peace through diplomacy. I admire the efforts of American leaders like Tip O'Neill; Ted Kennedy; George Mitchell; and my colleague, RICHIE NEAL, who were all instrumental in negotiating a long-lasting peace.

I firmly believe the agreement accompanied by the efforts of community activists and leaders willing to work for peace and commit to a political framework was and remains essential to creating stability in the region. We must continue to support the ongoing efforts to promote integration and reconciliation and address the impacts of intergenerational trauma.

Leaders like Monica McWilliams and Jane Morrice, as well as countless others working on these issues today, recognize that peace does not begin and end only on Good Friday. The work they do and the work of others healed divided communities and should and must go on.

This resolution not only remembers those who lost their lives during the Troubles but also recognizes challenges and opportunities of maintaining the hard-fought peace that followed. Let Bloody Sunday serve as a reminder of the hard work and pain to achieve harmony.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEUSER. I yield myself such time as I may consume, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. KEATING, and wish him a happy Saint Patrick's Day as well as thank him for bringing this resolution to the floor today.

Madam Speaker, happy St. Patrick's Day.

This January marked the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday when British troops in Derry, Northern Ireland, shot at a crowd of innocent protesters, killing 14 people. This unjustified act of violence marks a low point in the difficult history of Ireland in the 20th century. In fact, Bloody Sunday was just one of many tragic episodes during the Troubles which lasted 33 years and resulted in as many as 3,000 deaths.

This bipartisan resolution we are considering today commemorates this solemn anniversary. It also serves to remind the world that there is still work to be done to achieve full reconciliation and safeguard a lasting peace for all Irish people.

With the support of the United States, the 1998 Good Friday Agreement brought an end to the violence that characterized the Troubles and began a process to establish peace in Northern Ireland. Stories about atrocities, violence, and repression began to recede from the headlines. Today, Northern Ireland's story is one of prosperity, freedom, and peace.

Issues remain, however, and the United States and the U.S. Congress must continue to engage strongly in the pursuit of an enduring peaceful future for Northern Ireland.

The Good Friday Agreement signed in 1998 is the best framework to achieve this noble end. While post-Brexit arrangements for Northern Ireland have posed challenges to this historic agreement, both sides have worked in good faith to resolve them. This resolution also encourages both the European Union and Great Britain to continue acting in good faith negotiations to implement Brexit's Northern Ireland protocol.

I support our transatlantic allies' efforts to find a more workable solution for trade not only at the north-south Irish land border, but also at the Irish Sea border between Northern Ireland and Great Britain.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue the U.S. legacy of supporting a lasting peace in Northern

Ireland by joining me in supporting this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his support and for his bipartisan efforts at healing and moving forward.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), who is a friend of Ireland and a friend of mine. He is a champion of civil rights causes.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as well as my fellow Pennsylvanian, another great Commonwealth. You know which one I am partial toward.

Madam Speaker, I not only thank Chairman KEATING for his leadership in pushing this resolution but also thank him for the eloquent words that he just spoke. He laid out the situation quite clearly. I would like to just briefly elaborate.

□ 1345

Former British Prime Minister David Cameron, to his great credit, said these words about a decade ago: ''There is no doubt, there is nothing equivocal, there are no ambiguities. What happened on Bloody Sunday was both unjustified and unjustifiable. It was wrong.'' He further went on to say: ''I am deeply sorry on behalf of the British Government.''

Now, despite those truly admirable words and despite the findings and acknowledgment made by successive British Governments, shamefully, none of the individuals involved in the murder of 14 innocent civilians on Bloody Sunday have ever been held accountable.

This resolution says: ''The lack of accountability and justice provided to those who perished from the unlawful use of force on Bloody Sunday is both shameful and dangerous.''

Madam Speaker, we remember those who perished. We also recognize the family members of those who were harmed and killed on Bloody Sunday who fought for decades and decades to finally get justice.

But we must go further than that. A few weeks ago, I led a bipartisan letter—and, again, this whole effort has been bipartisan, which is always the case when it comes to the issue of peace in Ireland here in the United States. I led a bipartisan letter to object to the British Government's latest plan to institute an amnesty, a blanket amnesty. I quote from this resolution, which is similar to the letter that we sent.

''We oppose any attempt by the British Government to implement amnesty or statute of limitation laws that would end or inhibit investigations and prosecutions of crimes committed during the Troubles, including on Bloody Sunday.''

The resolution further goes on to talk about today and: ''Calls upon the involved parties to fully implement the Northern Ireland Protocol as agreed upon in the interest of maintaining peace and stability on the island of Ireland.''

Madam Speaker, today, in the United States and around the world, as we celebrate St. Patrick's Day, all of us, whether like me of Irish descent or not, let us also make sure that we don't lose sight of this important civil rights issue.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a champion of the Good Friday Agreement, a person who I mentioned in my remarks was there at the time, working to make it successful. Ireland and the Good Friday Agreement have no greater leader and supporter.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, both friends of ours, for their words.

On this very important day, St. Patrick's Day, we are acknowledging a very important anniversary. Anybody who knows much about Irish history knows that anniversaries are very important. The acknowledgment of certain events that occurred throughout the sometimes perilous history of this small country of 6 million people, north and south, are reminded of just how grim Bloody Sunday was.

I knew those families. I recall when the former Prime Minister of the U.K., David Cameron, acknowledged years after in a public statement, in a speech that he made on the floor of the House of Commons, the then-Prime Minister acknowledged that Bloody Sunday had victimized innocent bystanders.

For a long time, the argument had been made that these were paramilitaries on both sides. It was only the test of history that fully acknowledged the truth of what happened on that day.

Their civil rights movement in the north was modeled, in some measure, upon the civil rights movement here in America. I knew John Hume very well. He was a great man at a great moment. I have known Gerry Adams and others who participated in these very difficult events. But out of this tumultuous time came something else, and that was the Good Friday Agreement.

We are now coming upon the 25th anniversary of that agreement. America is a guarantor of the Good Friday Agreement. Successive Presidents of the United States, Democrat and Republican, have all embraced the Good Friday Agreement as the way forward, the path, understanding as well that the success of the Good Friday Agreement came about because everybody had to give up something.

The Republic of Ireland gave up Articles 2 and 3 of its Constitution, which laid claim to the six counties of the north, and the United Kingdom gave up the border, which was a huge issue. Strand 2 of the Good Friday Agreement reinforced the idea of a growing relationship between Dublin and Belfast.

Let me lay this out in perspective, in the time I have remaining.

Thirty years ago, in the north of Ireland, there were 30,000 British soldiers in an area geographically the size of the State of Connecticut. You couldn't go anyplace. It was a militarized zone. The Friends of Ireland, which is 40 years old—always Democrat and Republican, we made sure of it—the success of the Good Friday Agreement came about because of the goodwill of the men and women who live on that island.

We should be celebrating the outcome of the Good Friday Agreement. But part of it is also acknowledging these perilous moments in Irish history. I suspect that we will be discussing for years to come Americans' dimension to bringing about the Good Friday Agreement.

Just think of it: Two generations of children have now grown up in this small, six-county area not knowing anything about the violence.

It was the reach and the role of the United States, an honest broker, that helped bring about that agreement, which, even with bumps, people have fully acknowledged it has worked. So the template is there.

As we celebrate the ancient culture of St. Patrick's Day, there is something else for people of subjugation, occupation, An Gorta Mor, as the Great Famine is known, or civil wars, risings, and revolutions, that indomitable spirit on that tiny island, which we just celebrated, Republican and Democrat, with the President of the United States, last evening with the Taoiseach, the Prime Minister of Ireland, talking about the lasting bond between the two countries.

I hope that people will use the example of what the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Pennsylvania have done today, because they have acknowledged this very important moment.

What happened on Bloody Sunday, the world had a chance to witness, and it helped shape world opinion. Thank you both for doing this today. There is not a better way to honor St. Patrick than what you two have laid out today.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a champion of civil rights here in this country, a civil rights movement in this country that helped inspire the Good Friday Agreement.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership.

How honored I am to be on the floor with RICHARD NEAL, who had a major and forceful engagement in bringing about the recognition of those who were murdered in 1972.

I thank my friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle for joining in

this bipartisan effort, and I reenforce Chairman NEAL's comments about the bipartisan celebration of this great day and the great people of Ireland.

I am happy to be on the floor on St. Patrick's Day, and I wish all of my constituents, and friends across the nation of the great green, a happy St. Patrick's Day. But I come to make sure this day, Bloody Sunday, is certainly not forgotten.

I am so glad Chairman NEAL indicated its inspiration came from the toil and the soldiers on the battlefield, Madam Speaker, our beloved friend John Lewis, in the civil rights movement, and those who are willing to sacrifice for their belief and justice.

I am so glad that we ultimately found the truth to recognize John ''Jackie'' Duddy, Patrick ''Paddy'' Doherty, Bernard ''Barney'' McGuigan, Hugh Gilmour, Kevin McElhinney, MICHAEL KELLY, John Young, William Nash, Michael McDaid, James ''Jim'' Wray, Gerald Donaghy, Gerald McKinney, William ''Willie'' McKinney, and John Johnston, who tragically lost their lives.

As this resolution indicates, British soldiers came and shot them down. They did not understand their seeking of dignity and the rights that they had. So Bloody Sunday almost tracked some of the terrible issues that we had, but these people died and were injured, and many families for decades were denied truth.

I think it is very important that we stand on the floor today in a bipartisan way to honor that and to applaud Prime Minister David Cameron, who went to the House of Commons and apologized and said that the events that took place on Bloody Sunday were unjustified, unjustifiable, and wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, how sad and maybe even criminal it was to ignore this for so many years. How grateful we would be when those who died for their rights, for justice, for equality, the very same tenets we all adhere to here in the United States.

Let me draw in now and conclude my remarks by joining in the resolution that urges the European Union, including the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom, to act in good faith with regard to negotiations around Brexit and the implementation of the Northern Ireland Protocol. But more importantly, let me emphasize the importance of the relationship between the United Kingdom, the United States, and Ireland. Let me track the fact that we believe in justice, we believe in civil rights, and we believe in the idea of the speech of empowerment and the speech of democracy.

Let us not resort to bloodiness and the killing of those who simply seek to speak for justice for them and their families.

Today, in commemoration of Bloody Sunday, never again.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 888, which expresses the hope for justice for the victims of Bloody Sunday, one of the most tragic of days during the Troubles, on its 50th anniversary, as well as acknowledging the progress made in fostering peace in Northern Ireland and on the island of Ireland in recent decades.

On January 30, 1972, 26 unarmed civilians were shot by British soldiers during a protest that began peacefully in Derry, resulting in the death of 14 individuals in a massacre now known as Bloody Sunday, or the Bogside Massacre.

Bloody Sunday is one of the most significant and deadly injustices to take place during the Troubles—also known as the Northern Ireland conflict—and describes the struggle between Irish Roman Catholics and British who sided with Irish Protestants that lasted from the 1960s until 1998.

None of the 26 unarmed people shot by British Army soldiers posed a threat of causing death or serious injury, or were doing anything that could justify their shooting.

The families of these victims were denied for decades an honest and comprehensive assessment of the events that took place on Bloody Sunday.

In 1998, after campaigns from the families of those injured and killed on Bloody Sunday, a second inquiry was established by the British Government, and it found without doubt that the shootings were the result of wrongful actions taken by British soldiers.

The lack of accountability and justice provided to those who perished and their families from this heinous use of force was unacceptable. They deserved justice.

Accountability and justice for the victims of Bloody Sunday would represent a step toward addressing Northern Ireland's legacy of violence and promoting reconciliation.

This conflict was rooted in suppression, silencing the voices of those who differ from you by taking away their freedoms and their liberties.

As an African American woman in the United States, I know too well the struggles of oppression.

The march led by our Beloved John Lewis from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama that resulted in the brutal beating of marchers by police is known as Bloody Sunday is a turning point in the civil rights struggle.

I stand with the victims of Bloody Sunday, because whenever oppression happens anywhere around the world, and people risk losing their freedoms and their liberty, I will always stand with them.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I do thank my colleagues for their articulate, eloquent, and important words: Chairman NEAL, my friend Representative BOYLE, Chairman KEATING, and Representative JACKSON Lee.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I again thank Chairman KEATING for his work on this bipartisan resolution to commemorate the anniversary of a tragic time in Northern Ireland.

It is fitting we are considering this resolution on St. Patrick's Day, a day when many Americans proudly display their Irish heritage, including my own family. My mother, formerly Maeve McMenomy; her father, my grandfather, Philip McMenomy, who descended directly from Ireland. As a matter of fact, my mother's mother was from Ukraine.

As you can imagine, we know how to get our Irish up in our family and enjoy St. Patrick's Day and also reflect on the important history in Ireland as well as the very unwarranted and deadly and destructive events taking place in Ukraine currently.

Today, we can also say that we are at peace, perhaps proud. The scenes of violence from the past years in Ireland have subsided that have reigned for more than 20 years.

I was sorry to hear that the Irish Prime Minister tested positive for COVID yesterday, so we all wish him a speedy recovery.

I do look forward to the United States and Ireland continuing to build on our strong relationship and advance our shared interests.

This resolution is important right now, because we have had, Madam Speaker, far too many Bloody Sundays, including in the United States. March 7, 1965, was a terrible Bloody Sunday in Selma, Alabama. The last several Sundays in Ukraine have been as well, with unnecessary bloodshed without justification.

In the words of a good Irishman, Bono of the band U2: ''No more.''

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. It is critical that the U.S. Congress speaks with one voice toward promoting lasting peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative MEUSER, for his very eloquent remarks and his bipartisan support and leadership on this issue for Ireland.

I want to record and reflect upon the people lost during these tragic events marked by Bloody Sunday. They are John ''Jack'' Duddy, Patrick ''Paddy'' Doherty, Bernard ''Barney'' McGuigan, Hugh Gilmour, Kevin McElhinney, Michael Kelly, John Young, William Nash, Michael McDaid, James Wray, Gerald Donaghy, Gerard McKinney, William McKinney, and John Johnston.

We need to remember and memorialize these people, young and old, who stood peacefully, and in defiance, in their support for their values.

While many, rightfully so, have been commended for their work to bring peace to the island of Ireland, the victims of the Bloody Sunday massacre made the ultimate sacrifice, fighting against repression and demanding peace.

To the victims of Bloody Sunday; all victims of The Troubles, including the disappeared; the families of the victims; and the people of Ireland and Northern Ireland, I say this directly to you: We, in Congress, remember. We, in Congress, stand with you. We, in Congress, know there is much more work still to be done.

I introduced this resolution to demonstrate our solidarity with you, and I urge passage to signal that we will continue to fight for peace and stability on the island of Ireland.

With that spirit, I wish you all a happy St. Patrick's Day, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us by voting in the affirmative on this important resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 888, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: ''A resolution condemning the killing of 14 individuals and violence on Bloody Sunday, one of the most tragic of days during the Troubles 50 years ago, and calling on all parties to take meaningful steps toward peace and reconciliation.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENDING NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA AND BELARUS ACT

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7108) to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7108

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States is a founding member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and is committed to ensuring that the WTO remains an effective forum for peaceful economic engagement.

(2) Ukraine is a sovereign nation-state that is entitled to enter into agreements with other sovereign states and to full respect of its territorial integrity.

(3) The United States will be unwavering in its support for a secure, democratic, and sovereign Ukraine, free to choose its own leaders and future.

(4) Ukraine acceded to the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO Agreement) and has been a WTO member since 2008.

(5) Ukraine's participation in the WTO Agreement creates both rights and obligations vis-à-vis other WTO members.

(6) The Russian Federation acceded to the WTO on August 22, 2012, becoming the 156th WTO member, and the Republic of Belarus has applied to accede to the WTO.

(7) From the date of its accession, the Russian Federation committed to apply fully all provisions of the WTO.

(8) The United States Congress authorized permanent normal trade relations for the Russian Federation through the Russia and Moldova Jackson-Vanik Repeal and Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–208).

(9) Ukraine communicated to the WTO General Council on March 2, 2022, urging that all WTO members take action against the Russian Federation and ''consider further steps with the view to suspending the Russian Federation's participation in the WTO for its violation of the purpose and principles of this Organization''.

(10) Vladimir Putin, a ruthless dictator, has led the Russian Federation into a war of aggression against Ukraine, which—

(A) denies Ukraine and its people their collective rights to independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity;

(B) constitutes an emergency in international relations, because it is a situation of armed conflict that threatens the peace and security of all countries, including the United States; and

(C) denies Ukraine its rightful ability to participate in international organizations, including the WTO.

(11) The Republic of Belarus, also led by a ruthless dictator, Aleksander Lukashenka, is providing important material support to the Russian Federation's aggression.

(12) The Russian Federation's exportation of goods in the energy sector is central to its ability to wage its war of aggression on Ukraine.

(13) The United States, along with its allies and partners, has responded to recent aggression by the Russian Federation in Ukraine by imposing sweeping financial sanctions and stringent export controls.

(14) The United States cannot allow the consequences of the Russian Federation's actions to go unaddressed, and must lead fellow countries, in all fora, including the WTO, to impose appropriate consequences for the Russian Federation's aggression.

SEC. 3. SUSPENSION OF NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS.

(a) NONDISCRIMINATORY TARIFF TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the rates of duty set forth in column 2 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States shall apply to all products of the Russian Federation and of the Republic of Belarus.

(b) AUTHORITY TO PROCLAIM INCREASED COLUMN 2 RATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may proclaim increases in the rates of duty applicable to products of the Russian Federation or the Republic of Belarus, above the rates set forth in column 2 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(2) PRIOR CONSULTATION.—The President shall, not later than 5 calendar days before issuing any proclamation under paragraph (1), consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate regarding the basis for and anticipated impact of the proposed increases to rates of duty described in paragraph (1).

(3) TERMINATION.—The authority to issue proclamations under this subsection shall terminate on January 1, 2024.

SEC. 4. RESUMPTION OF APPLICATION OF HTS COLUMN 1 RATES OF DUTY AND RESTORATION OF NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT FOR THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS.

(a) TEMPORARY APPLICATION OF HTS COLUMN 1 RATES OF DUTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including the application of column 2 rates of duty under section 3), the President is authorized to temporarily resume, for one or more periods not to exceed 1 year each, the application of the rates of duty set forth in column 1 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to the products of the Russian Federation, the Republic of Belarus, or both, if the President submits to Congress with respect to either or both such countries a certification under subsection (c) for each such period. Such action shall take effect beginning on the date that is 90 calendar days after the date of submission of such certification for such period, unless there is enacted into law during such 90-day period a joint resolution of disapproval.

(2) CONSULTATION AND REPORT.—The President shall, not later than 45 calendar days before submitting a certification under paragraph (1)—

(A) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) submit to both such committees a report that explains the basis for the determination of the President contained in such certification.

(b) RESTORATION OF NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to resume the application of the rates of duty set forth in column 1 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to the products of the Russian Federation, the Republic of Belarus, or both, if the President submits to Congress with respect to either or both such countries a certification under subsection (c). Such action shall take effect beginning on the date that is 90 calendar days after the date of submission of such certification, unless there is enacted into law during such 90-day period a joint resolution of disapproval.

(2) CONSULTATION AND REPORT.—The President shall, not later than 45 calendar days before submitting a certification under paragraph (1)—

(A) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) submit to both such committees a report that explains the basis for the determination of the President contained in such certification.

(3) PRODUCTS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—If the President submits pursuant to paragraph (1) a certification under subsection (c) with respect to the Russian Federation and a joint resolution of disapproval is not enacted during the 90-day period described in that paragraph, the President may grant permanent nondiscriminatory tariff treatment (normal trade relations) to the products of the Russian Federation.

(4) PRODUCTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS.—If the President submits pursuant to paragraph (1) a certification under subsection (c) with respect to the Republic of Belarus and a joint resolution of disapproval is not enacted during the 90-day period described in that paragraph, the President may, subject to the provisions of chapter 1 of

title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), grant nondiscriminatory tariff treatment (normal trade relations) to the products of the Republic of Belarus.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—A certification under this subsection is a certification in writing that—

(1) specifies the action proposed to be taken pursuant to the certification and whether such action is pursuant to subsection (a)(1) or (b)(1) of this section; and

(2) contains a determination of the President that the Russian Federation or the Republic of Belarus (or both)—

(A) has reached an agreement relating to the respective withdrawal of Russian or Belarusian forces (or both, if applicable) and cessation of military hostilities that is accepted by the free and independent government of Ukraine;

(B) poses no immediate military threat of aggression to any North Atlantic Treaty Organization member; and

(C) recognizes the right of the people of Ukraine to independently and freely choose their own government.

(d) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

(1) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''joint resolution of disapproval'' means only a joint resolution—

(A) which does not have a preamble;

(B) the title of which is as follows: ''Joint resolution disapproving the President's certification under section 4(c) of the Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act.''; and

(C) the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That Congress disapproves the certification of the President under section 4(c) of the Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act, submitted to Congress on _____'', the blank space being filled in with the appropriate date.

(2) INTRODUCTION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—During a period of 5 legislative days beginning on the date that a certification under subsection (c) is submitted to Congress, a joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced in the House of Representatives by the majority leader or the minority leader.

(3) INTRODUCTION IN THE SENATE.—During a period of 5 days on which the Senate is in session beginning on the date that a certification under subsection (c) is submitted to Congress, a joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced in the Senate by the majority leader (or the majority leader's designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader's designee).

(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee of the House to which a joint resolution of disapproval has been referred has not reported such joint resolution within 10 legislative days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration thereof.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution of disapproval has been referred reports it to the House or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on a joint resolution with regard to the same certification. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(5) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Finance.

(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the Committee on Finance has not reported such joint resolution of disapproval within 10 days on which the Senate is in session after the date of referral of such joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(C) MOTION TO PROCEED.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the Committee on Finance reports the joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from its consideration (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) shall be waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution of disapproval is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(D) DEBATE.—Debate on the joint resolution of disapproval, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution of disapproval is not in order.

(E) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on the joint resolution of disapproval and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate, if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

(F) RULES OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to the joint resolution of disapproval shall be decided without debate.

(G) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to the joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with such joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(6) PROCEDURES IN THE SENATE.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the following procedures shall apply in the Senate to a joint resolution of disapproval to which this subsection applies:

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a joint resolution of disapproval that has passed the House of Representatives shall, when received in the Senate, be referred to the Committee on Finance for consideration in accordance with this subsection.

(B) If a joint resolution of disapproval to which this subsection applies was introduced in the Senate before receipt of a joint resolution of disapproval that has passed the House of Representatives, the joint resolution from the House of Representatives shall, when received in the Senate, be placed on the calendar. If this subparagraph applies, the procedures in the Senate with respect to a joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate that contains the identical matter as the joint resolution of disapproval that passed the House of Representatives shall be the same as if no joint resolution of disapproval had been received from the House of Representatives, except that the vote on passage in the Senate shall be on the joint resolution of disapproval that passed the House of Representatives.

(7) RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of legislation described in those sections, and supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 5. COOPERATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY AT THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION.

The United States Trade Representative shall use the voice and influence of the United States at the WTO to—

(1) condemn the recent aggression in Ukraine;

(2) encourage other WTO members to suspend trade concessions to the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus;

(3) consider further steps with the view to suspend the Russian Federation's participation in the WTO; and

(4) seek to halt the accession process of the Republic of Belarus at the WTO and cease accession-related work.

SEC. 6. MODIFICATIONS TO AND REAUTHORIZATION OF SANCTIONS UNDER THE GLOBAL MAGNITSKY HUMAN RIGHTS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT WITH RESPECT TO HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1262 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended by striking paragraph (2).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended by inserting after section 1262 (as amended by subsection (a)) the following new section:

''SEC. 1262A. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

''It is the sense of Congress that the President should establish and regularize information sharing and sanctions-related decision-making with like-minded governments possessing human rights and anti-corruption sanctions programs similar in nature to those authorized under this subtitle.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2(b) and in title XII of division A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) are each amended by inserting after

the items relating to section 1262 the following:

''Sec. 1262A. Sense of Congress.''.

(c) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1263 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any foreign person that the President determines, based on credible information—

''(1) is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in, serious human rights abuse;

''(2) is a current or former government official, or a person acting for or on behalf of such an official, who is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in—

''(A) corruption, including—

''(i) the misappropriation of state assets;

''(ii) the expropriation of private assets for personal gain;

''(iii) corruption related to government contracts or the extraction of natural resources; or

''(iv) bribery; or

''(B) the transfer or facilitation of the transfer of the proceeds of corruption;

''(3) is or has been a leader or official of—

''(A) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, any of the activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) during the tenure of the leader or official; or

''(B) an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section as a result of activities during the tenure of the leader or official;

''(4) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of—

''(A) an activity described in paragraph (1) or (2) that is conducted by a foreign person;

''(B) a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section; or

''(C) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, an activity described in paragraph (1) or (2) conducted by a foreign person; or

''(5) is owned or controlled by, or has acted or been purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section.''.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended by striking ''violations of human rights'' and inserting ''corruption and human rights abuses''.

(3) REQUESTS BY CONGRESS.—Subsection (d)(2) of such section is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking ''HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS'' and inserting ''SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSE'';

(ii) by striking ''described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)'' and inserting ''described in subsection (a) relating to serious human rights abuse''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''described in paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (a)'' and inserting ''described in subsection (a) relating to corruption or the transfer or facilitation of the transfer of the proceeds of corruption''; and

(ii) by striking ''ranking member of—'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees.''.

(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 1264(a) of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) a description of additional steps taken by the President through diplomacy, international engagement, and assistance to foreign or security sectors to address persistent underlying causes of serious human rights abuse and corruption in each country in which foreign persons with respect to which sanctions have been imposed under section 1263 are located; and

''(8) a description of additional steps taken by the President to ensure the pursuit of judicial accountability in appropriate jurisdictions with respect to those foreign persons subject to sanctions under section 1263 for serious human rights abuse and corruption.''.

(e) REPEAL OF SUNSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1265 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is repealed.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2(b) and in title XII of division A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) are each amended by striking the items relating to section 1265.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BEATTY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, yesterday morning, Congress heard directly from Ukrainian President Zelenskyy. He showed us the absolute horrors that Russia is inflicting on the Ukrainian people in full view of the world, and he pleaded for us to do more.

With the legislation that stands before us at this hour, we intend to answer his call. Ranking Member BRADY and I have been united in our desire to end permanent normal trade relations with Russia. And I must say that Mr. BRADY has been very consistent as we have discussed this legislation.

With the House passage of H.R. 7108 today, we will take that impactful step and place even greater economic pressure on Putin and his brutal regime. We must do everything in our power to hold Russia accountable for the atrocities it is committing hourly in the nation of Ukraine.

This is an unprovoked horror that the world is seeing. Our partners and allies are joining with us in this effort, taking similar steps to further isolate Putin and his regime from the rest of the civilized world.

I urge every single one of our colleagues today to support the Ukrainian people, punish Russia for its ruthless aggression, and vote to advance this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, yesterday, President Zelenskyy made a passionate plea to the United States and all free nations to stand with the brave people of Ukraine against Putin's deadly ambitions and heartbreaking genocide.

After showing gut-wrenching footage of Ukrainian cities torn apart by missiles and machine guns, he said to be the leader of the world means to be the leader of peace.

Today, Madam Speaker, we have the opportunity to lead, and I thank Chairman NEAL for his great leadership and work on this bipartisan provision.

After bipartisan public pressure from lawmakers in Congress in both parties, President Biden announced his support for suspending Russia's special trade status. We are taking that action with today's bill.

I was proud to have helped lead this bipartisan effort in the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. Both parties in Congress came together quickly, working in good faith on a bipartisan and bicameral agreement to immediately ban purchases of Russian energy and suspend our trading relationship with Russia and Belarus.

We don't take these steps lightly, but Russia's aggression requires this approach.

Russia will no longer enjoy the same special trade status with America as the country it is invading, so it will no longer be able to sell made-in-Russia products in the United States at lower tariffs.

Combined with the energy import ban Congress passed last week, which targets 60 percent of what Russia sells us, this provision targets the remaining 40 percent, hurting Russia's economy and cutting off funding for its war effort.

Said another way, American dollars will no longer fund Russia's war machine. This is another step in the right direction and includes further incentives for Russia to end its aggression.

This bill includes tough conditions to be met for restoring Russia's trade status, including Russian action to end hostilities, protecting the freedom and sovereignty of Ukraine, and ensuring the end of Russia's aggression.

The same tough conditions apply if the President seeks to end the energy import ban, and I plan to work with colleagues in the Senate to achieve that.

Going forward, we must continue to work closely with our allies to increase

pressure on Russia and ensure this is an effective global effort. Neighboring Canada has also taken serious action to do both of these, and other nations have announced their intentions to do the same.

Unfortunately, the administration's executive orders and the bill we are voting on today both fail to soften the impact of the oil ban by replacing Russian oil with made-in-America energy.

We have seen the highest year-over-year increase in wholesale prices ever recorded. Nearly half the price increases in goods come from the rise in the price of gasoline over the past year.

Nothing in this bill creates access to more American-made energy on- and offshore, nor does it approve American pipelines that could easily replace Russian oil with U.S. and Canadian energy, or accelerate approval for delayed permits for American export facilities to help the world wean themselves from the grip of dirty Russian energy.

There is still yet more Congress can do. I would like to see Congress sanction Russian energy companies so they can't continue to profit and fuel the war machine.

It is also time for Congress to unleash America's own ability to be energy independent, replace Russian oil with American sources, and use our energy strengths to wean the world from Russian energy.

Finally, I want to make it clear to my colleagues: This bipartisan and bicameral agreement applies only to the suspension of normal trade relations with Russia. I do not support the inclusion of the Democrats' Foreign Affairs Committee's Global Magnitsky Act in this bill, which includes changes to the original statute that I believe are unnecessarily vague and could lead to future abuses.

I understand this expanded language may have been included in a temporary executive order by the previous administration to address human rights, but I don't believe it is warranted in a permanent expansion of this law. I am confident there are Senators who share my concerns, and I strongly urge them to remove that provision for future vetting.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee who has been a real leader on this issue.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, it is great to see the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) come together with the ranking member.

Congressman DOGGETT and I introduced legislation 3 weeks ago. This completes what we had. I am sorry that we were unable to move forward, but I am pleased that the White House now feels comfortable moving forward with this legislation.

It is important that we are moving in concert with our allies, but I think we need that sense of urgency, based on what we heard again yesterday from President Zelenskyy.

What we have done in Congress with the administration has damaged the Russian economy for decades, watching what has happened in terms of the collapse of the ruble, the cratering of their stock market, raising the cost of living for ordinary Russians, not just chasing the yachts of the oligarchs.

We have a quarter of the WTO that accounts for about 58 percent of the global domestic product. Moving to suspend this MFN standing means the Russian economy will face higher tariff rates, export bans, investment restrictions, export licensing requirements, customs hurdles, restrictions on cross-border services, and unequal treatment for intellectual property and rules of origin.

All of these further cripple the Russian economy. This is another tightening of that noose, sending a signal.

I hope there is more that we can do economically in terms of weapons, maybe even find a way to get MiGs to the Ukrainians without starting World War III.

But in the meantime, it is critical to move forward, to finish the job we started 3 weeks ago. I am pleased to support it.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from west Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, suspending Russia's normal trade relation status with the United States is the right and absolutely necessary thing to do.

I have to note, Madam Speaker, that our President continues to take an incremental and piecemeal response to Vladimir Putin and this unprovoked attack on Ukraine. It is wholly inadequate. Not only will it not deter this tyrant, I fear it will embolden other adversaries to follow suit.

Madam Speaker, we have to stop assaulting oil and gas. This has to be an early warning to the United States and lawmakers.

We can steward the environment. We should. But we have to understand the geopolitical importance of energy independence. We can do both. This is America.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues, all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to support this suspension. But I urge my President: Be more resolute. Act with a sense of urgency. Provide the war machines and weaponry that the Ukrainians need to fight for their freedom and independence.

God bless America.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), who has been a real leader on this issue as well.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, the day after Russia invaded Ukraine, I introduced the centerpiece of today's legislation with Congressman BLUMENAUER. It denied Russia preferential trade treatment and would expel it from the World Trade Organization.

At that time, 3 weeks ago, there was hope that economic sanctions like this might limit the extent of Putin's brutal aggression. Now we have seen that economic sanctions are having no immediate impact to limit the slaughter from Putin's war of annihilation against Ukraine.

Uniting the world to isolate Russia has weakened the ruble, certainly, but it has not stopped Putin from reducing so much of Ukraine to rubble.

While I favor excluding every possible Russian import, this bill will grant President Biden appropriate authority to raise tariffs significantly on any Russian import that is permitted, and the same for Belarus.

This is largely the same bill on which I sought action last week until President Biden requested a delay.

□ 1415

Surprisingly, this bill does not include the ban on Russian energy imports that this House approved overwhelmingly last week on the bill that we considered then. I hope that ban will be restored in further work on the legislation.

Though important to finally approve this bill as another way to isolate Russia, we should recognize there is no substitute for getting Ukrainians all of the weaponry that they have requested, including jet fighters, to stop the mass murder we observe daily.

The financial pain imposed won't immediately ease the pain of Ukrainian families. They are paying in blood while we pay in dollars, but it is one way for us to hold Putin accountable and to act in solidarity with them.

To those who ask that we adopt further sanctions or more weapons only if Russia does something more, I say what more barbaric butchery need we see before doing everything we possibly can, short of sending troops into Ukraine. The time to do everything is now, the time to provide for Ukrainian refugees to enter our country is now.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), the Republican leader of the Trade Subcommittee.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the long overdue legislation to hold Russia accountable for its invasion of Ukraine. It is unfortunate it took so long to get to this point, but I am glad we have finally reached a consensus.

This bill, as you know, revokes permanent normal trade relations for Russia and normal trade relations for Belarus, putting them in the same trade category as North Korea and Cuba, and appropriately so.

The U.S. must take the lead in showing the real economic consequences of violent acts against NATO members and partners, and this bill is a key element of that.

We were all moved by President Zelenskyy's address earlier this week,

and I am glad we are finally answering his call for additional assistance. We can and should do more, especially when it comes to banning energy imports from Russia.

As Republican leader of the Trade Subcommittee, I am glad this bill is finally seeing a vote on the House floor. I support this bill and certainly urge my colleagues to do the same so we can use the trade tools at our disposal to hold Vladimir Putin accountable.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), who has had a longstanding interest in human rights.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, the Putin regime requires every strategy and every action that we can muster to put a stop to Russia and restore sanity to our world order.

Russia's aggressive and brutal behavior, brutal actions towards Ukraine is beyond what I call the pale. We have no other choice but to step in and put a stop to it.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support this resolution.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7108. Everyone here on the floor with me today can agree that Russia's aggression in Ukraine with Belarus in support is reprehensible and wrong.

While I strongly believe that this next round of sanctions will continue to hold Russia and Belarus accountable, we also can't ignore soaring fertilizer costs already propelled by global supply chain issues. Russia and Belarus, unfortunately, are major exporters of fertilizer and these sanctions may drive costs even higher.

But skyrocketing fertilizer costs won't affect my support for this bill. Peace must be achieved by all available measures. I will turn my focus now to solutions to drive fertilizer costs back down.

From temporarily or completely eliminating barriers for fertilizer trade from other nations, to input subsidies for our producers to offset input costs, we must be willing to put all available solutions on the table.

I have always argued that food security is national security, and I will continue to work with my colleagues to alleviate fertilizer costs to our farmers in order to grow food for our shelves.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), a champion of human rights everywhere.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the world right now, not just Ukraine, but indeed the world, is engaged in a fight between democracy and autocracy. That is what is at stake on what is now the battlefields of Ukraine.

I was in Brussels 3 weeks ago at NATO, and I am proud to say I have never seen the West and the transatlantic alliance this united. Certainly, not since the days of the Cold War.

Madam Speaker, our trade policy must work in sync with our foreign policy. That is what we are doing here today by revoking this status on Russia as well as Belarus. I strongly support it. I am proud of the fact that the United States and other countries have acted so quickly, in just a matter of a few weeks, to put the strongest sanctions on Russia in American history.

We must do this, and we must do even more.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ), the first Ukrainian-born Member of the United States Congress.

Mrs. SPARTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act. It is very important to highlight here that we are do include Belarus in this act. Unfortunately, under the leadership of President Lukashenko, Belarus allowed Russians to place ballistic rockets and shell fellow Slavs, orthodox Christians in Ukraine for weeks. The people of Belarus need to understand that their leader is part of what is happening in this genocide in Ukraine, and we cannot create a loophole where Putin is going to use Belarus to funnel moneys through them.

This is very important legislation also to send a message to Putin and his allies that the West is serious. It is not a temporary thing. They cannot just go kill a bunch of people, destroy cities, kill women and children, and then go back and have business as usual.

Congress is sending a very strong message. If they want to have peace, it better be soon, and they better get to the table and stop this insanity in killing of the Ukrainian people.

I also want to share some of the concerns that the Congressman shared regarding the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act. I concur with him that these definitions have to be tightened and to broaden these definitions is giving too much power to the executive branch. It is not what Congress should do because every time we give too much power, we are not able to effectively have our oversight function.

So I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation but also work with the Senate to make sure that we can fix our concerns. I am very appreciative that we are able to come on a bipartisan basis and send a very strong message.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), whose entire career has been consistently based on the advancement of human rights everywhere.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I congratulate him on his leadership. The connection between human rights and economics is a connection that many of us have seen for a while. When it comes to some countries, for example China, when I was trying to get an adjustment in trade with China based on human rights, I was told, Oh, blah, blah, blah. But I said then and I say now of Russia, if we do not speak out for human rights because of commercial interests, we lose all moral authority to speak out for human rights in any small country in the world if these big countries are left off the hook.

Madam Speaker, as we convene today, war rages in Ukraine. Yesterday, the Congress had the great honor and privilege of receiving a virtual address by President Zelenskyy, whose heroic leadership has rallied his nation and inspired the world. Our Members were very moved by his powerful remarks as well as the heart-wrenching footage he shared showing the terror and brutality which Putin has unleashed in Ukraine, including committing war crimes against children.

So it is with great respect for President Zelenskyy's leadership and with unwavering support for the people of Ukraine that the House today takes another strong step to punish Russia for its war crimes.

It is my hope that this legislation receives strong bipartisan support, and I thank the chairman, Mr. NEAL, and the ranking member, Mr. BRADY, for working together to make that a reality because it is a recognition that is worthy of the valor and courage of the people of Ukraine.

The unimaginable courage, resilience, and determination of the Ukrainian people has been on full display, as they fight to not only protect their homeland but to defend democracy itself. The assault that Putin is making on Ukraine is an assault on democracy writ large. He is so cowardly and so insecure; he can't stand to see a democracy across the way from Russia for fear that the Russian people will see a better way instead of his autocracy. And so the Ukrainians are fighting for democracy writ large.

Yet, tragically, Putin has repeatedly responded by accelerating brutality, indiscriminately bombing major cities, attacking civilians attempting to evacuate the violence, and even murdering mothers and babies in a maternity hospital.

Russia's cruel and unprovoked invasion has already forced nearly 3 million Ukrainians to flee their homes, creating what the United Nations has called the fastest growing refugee crisis in Europe since World War II.

Because Putin shows no sign of ceasing his horrible aggression, the Congress today will take another step, in lockstep with the Biden administration and many of our allies, to tighten our stranglehold on the Russian economy.

The legislation the House will pass today represents an intense action to further isolate Russia and decimate its economy. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BRADY and Mr. NEAL for giving us this opportunity.

With this bill, the United States will suspend permanent normal trade relations with Russia, which means they will no longer enjoy preferential tariff treatment, take steps to review Russia's access to the World Trade Organization, and reauthorize and strengthen the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, so that we can impose even further individual sanctions.

In doing so, we will make it as difficult as possible for Russia to do business with the United States and our allies, and we will also suspend normal trade relations with Belarus for its shameful complicity in Russia's aggression.

Congress and the country salute Ways and Means Chairman RICHARD NEAL and Ranking Member KEVIN BRADY, who led the way to steer this legislation to the floor and garner strong bipartisan support for its passage. I would also like to thank Congressman LLOYD DOGGETT and Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER for their relentless leadership in showing that the House was ready with this legislation so we could act quickly and decisively and have the improving touches that Mr. BRADY and Mr. NEAL added to it.

The legislation we pass today builds on swift, devastating sanctions already being imposed on Russia by America and our allies. We take this step with extraordinary unity not only within Congress on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, but also between the Congress and the administration.

□ 1430

And we do so with historic coordination with our neighbors abroad, as the members of the G7 and European Union have all agreed to revoke most-favored-nation status from Russia.

On behalf of the Congress, I salute President Biden for unifying our allies so that we could move together with this crushing blow. And we will continue working together to make Putin accountable for his despicable crimes as he violates the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine.

What Putin is doing in Ukraine, bombing civilians, targeting children, is outside, Madam Speaker, the circle of civilized human behavior. He is committing war crimes and he must be held accountable.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong, bipartisan ''aye'' vote.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, the United States is the greatest market in the world to do business with. Our consumer spending is double that of the European Union, and more than triple that of China. Every country on Earth wants to do business with America.

As we deal with the unjust invasion of Ukraine by Russia and continue to modernize our Nation's trade deals, like we did with the USMCA, we must keep in mind that the American marketplace is not something that is a right. It is a privilege for those that uphold international order.

For far too long, many have overlooked repeated abuses by certain trading partners. For whatever reason, they decided it was okay for the United States to do business with those that lie, cheat, and steal in violation of international law.

This has been a terrible mistake. Trade, when done right, is a critical boost to the economy and our families. When done poorly, it enriches our adversaries at the expense of those who do uphold the international system.

It is clear that the unjust invasion of Ukraine by Russia cannot stand. Congress must make clear to the world that normal trade relations with the United States must be reserved for honest brokers that adhere to international order. This is the moment when irresponsible trade with the United States without consequence comes to an end.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), who has had a long history as a champion of human rights.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to put the full force of the American people and this Congress behind dismantling the savage Kremlin war machine.

This legislation shows President Zelenskyy, Ukrainians, and the world that America will boldly confront Russia's savage attacks on the Ukrainian people. This bill also holds Belarus to account for its complicity in Russia's murderous aggression.

They each will learn what every tyrant must: If you invade another nation, normal trade within our global economy is over.

While President Biden marshals the free world to fiscally cripple Putin and his oligarchs, this Congress will also move to crush Russia's militarized economic might.

So this legislation also reviews Russia's and Belarus' access to the World Trade Organization, and it extends and strengthens the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, both of which will further clip Russia's economic wings.

The grisly, heartbreaking images President Zelenskyy showed us yesterday made clear that Russia must be punished. And with this legislation, the people of Ukraine and every global democracy can count on America to help make that happen.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE), the Republican leader of the Oversight Subcommittee.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, on February 8, President Biden said that if Russia invaded Ukraine, America would impose crippling sanctions.

On February 24, President Putin kept to his word and invaded Ukraine. President Biden has since then slow-walked the sanctions that he promised, those crippling sanctions that he promised.

Today, 3 weeks after the invasion, as we have watched on the news as Ukrainians have bravely fought, outmanned and outgunned, and yet they hold on tenaciously to their property at horrific costs. Their cities are being destroyed. Innocent civilians are being shot. Women and children are being attacked on the streets. And yet, the United States has been slow to move.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this long-overdue bill to suspend permanent normal trade relations with the Russian Federation and Belarus. I am a cosponsor of this legislation and would like to thank Chairman NEAL and Ranking Member BRADY for their hard work on this issue.

Last week, the House took the much-needed step of blocking oil and gas imports from Russia. When we debated that bill last week, I said we should have gone much further and should not have taken that watered-down approach.

The United States must stop projecting weakness to Putin and his allies. President Biden must live up to his word.

Today, we are finally taking a decisive step to punish Russia for their criminal aggression in Ukraine by ending their special treatment as a most-favored nation.

Can you imagine that we have continued to recognize them as a most-favored nation for three weeks, in light of the horrific war crimes that they are committing every day?

This is an action that only Congress can take, and we held off last week at the request of the administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, passing this bill will place significant tariffs on most of Russia's exports to the United States, further defunding Putin's war machine.

The bill also gives proclamation authority to the USTR to further raise tariffs on Russia's goods so that American purchasers will stop funding Putin's war crimes.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) who has been a consistent champion of human rights.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NEAL and Congressmen DOGGETT and BLUMENAUER for this important statement.

Slaughter is not a sufficient definition of what Putin and Putin's war is doing to the innocent Ukrainian people.

I rise in strong support of totally removing from them normal trade relations, as just a few weeks ago I was on

the border of Lithuania and Belarus, where the 30 to 40,000 Russian troops were poised, poised, ready to move and to slaughter.

How outrageous, when babies are killed, when hospitals with pregnant women, when a mother who lost her life because her pelvis was crushed, her baby and herself died because of Putin.

They continue to slaughter. They continue to destroy historic places. They continue to destroy hospitals and government buildings, and they are not ceasing.

So glory to Ukraine. We must stand with them and realize that their fight is our fight. As we in the civil rights movement experienced the idea of lack of justice, we know that this does not even equate to the violence that Russia is putting forth. I support this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7108, The Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act. The Act takes decisive action to respond to Russia's continued unprovoked attacks on the people of Ukraine and holds Belarus accountable for its support for Russia's aggression. This legislation counters Russia's unconscionable actions and Belarus' complicity by suspending normal trade relations with Russia and Belarus.

This legislation includes additional provisions to expand the United States' trade tools to stop Russia's unacceptable and unjust war on Ukraine and to hold Belarus accountable for its involvement. Specifically, the bill:

Provides the President with time-limited authority to increase tariffs on products of Russia and Belarus, until January 1, 2024;

Requires the U.S. Trade Representative to use the voice and influence of the United States to seek suspension of Russia's participation in the World Trade Organization (WTO) and to halt Belarus' WTO accession and accession-related work; and

Provides the President with the authority to restore normal trade relations with Russia and Belarus if these countries have ceased their acts of aggression against Ukraine and other certain conditions are met. Congress has the authority to overrule such decision through a congressional disapproval process.

Since Vladimir Putin began this war, the United States has had a relentless and devastating economic response in the form of sanctions.

Even prior to this legislation, the United States has already carried out the following actions:

The connection to the U.S. financial system for Russia's largest financial institution, Sberbank, including 25 subsidiaries, has been severed by imposing correspondent and payable-through account sanctions. This action restricts Sberbank's access to transactions made in the dollar. Sberbank is the largest bank in Russia, holds nearly one-third of the overall Russian banking sector's assets, is heavily connected to the global financial system, and is systemically critical to the Russian financial system.

Russia's second largest financial institution, VTB Bank (VTB), including 20 subsidiaries, have been appropriately subject to full blocking sanctions. This action freezes all of VTB's assets touching the U.S financial system and prohibits U.S. persons from dealing with them. VTB holds nearly one-fifth of the overall Russian banking sector's assets, is heavily exposed to the U.S. and western financial systems and is systemically critical to the Russian financial system.

Full blocking sanctions also extend to the three other major Russian financial institutions: Bank Otkritie, Sovcombank OJSC, and Novikombank- and 34 subsidiaries. These sanctions freeze any of these institutions' assets touching the U.S financial system and prohibit U.S. persons from dealing with them. These financial institutions play a significant role in the Russian economy.

New debt and equity restrictions have been imposed on thirteen of the most critical major Russian enterprises and entities. This includes restrictions on all transactions in, provision of financing for, and other dealings in new debt of greater than 14 days maturity and new equity issued by thirteen Russian state-owned enterprises and entities: Sberbank, AlfaBank, Credit Bank of Moscow, Gazprombank, Russian Agricultural Bank, Gazprom, Gazprom Neft, Transneft, Rostelecom, RusHydro, Alrosa, Sovcomflot, and Russian Railways. These entities, including companies critical to the Russian economy with estimated assets of nearly $1.4 trillion, are no longer able to raise money through the U.S. market—a key source of capital and revenue generation, which limits the Kremlin's ability to raise money for its activity.

There are additional full blocking sanctions on Russian elites and their family members: Sergei Ivanov (and his son, Sergei), Nikolai Patrushev (and his son Andrey), Igor Sechin (and his son Ivan), Andrey Puchkov, Yuriy Solviev (and two real estate companies he owns), Galina Ulyutina, and Alexander Vedyakhin. This action includes individuals who have enriched themselves at the expense of the Russian state, and have elevated their family members into some of the highest position of powers in the country. It also includes oligarchs who sit atop Russia's largest financial institutions and are responsible for providing the resources necessary to support Putin's invasion of Ukraine. This action follows up on yesterday's action targeting Russian elites and their family members and cuts them off from the U.S. financial system, freezes any assets they hold in the United States and blocks their travel to the United States.

Costs on Belarus for supporting a further invasion of Ukraine by sanctioning 24 Belarusian individuals and entities, including targeting Belarus' military and financial capabilities by sanctioning two significant Belarusian state-owned banks, nine defense firms, and seven regime-connected official and elites have been enacted.

Sweeping restrictions have been implemented on Russia's military to strike a blow to Putin's military and strategic ambitions. This includes measures against military end users, including the Russian Ministry of Defense. Exports of nearly all U.S. items and items produced in foreign countries using certain U.S.-origin software, technology, or equipment will be restricted to targeted military end users. These comprehensive restrictions apply to the Russian Ministry of Defense, including the Armed Forces of Russia, wherever located.

Russia-wide restrictions to choke off Russia's import of technological goods critical to a diversified economy and Putin's ability to project power are also present. This includes Russia-wide denial of exports of sensitive technology, primarily targeting the Russian defense, aviation, and maritime sectors to cut off Russia's access to cutting-edge technology. In addition to sweeping restrictions on the Russian-defense sector, the United States government will impose Russia-wide restrictions on sensitive U.S. technologies produced in foreign countries using U.S.-origin software, technology, or equipment. This includes Russia-wide restrictions on semiconductors, telecommunication, encryption security, lasers, sensors, navigation, avionics and maritime technologies. These severe and sustained controls will cut off Russia's access to cutting edge technology.

Historical multilateral cooperation serves as a force multiplier in restricting more than $50 billion in key inputs to Russia—impacting far more than that in Russia's production. As a result of this multilateral coordination, the United States has provided an exemption for other countries that adopt equally stringent measures. Countries that adopt substantially similar export restrictions are exempted from new U.S. licensing requirements for items produced in their countries. The European Union, Australia, Japan, Canada, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, have already communicated their plans for parallel actions. This unprecedented coordination significantly expands the scope of restrictions on Russia. Further engagement with Allies and partners will continue to maximize the impact on Russia's military capabilities.

Madam Speaker, taking further action against both Russia and Belarus on the international stage is of the utmost necessity in showing our European allies that we are steadfast in our opposition to this bloody war. The Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act does exactly that symbolically and literally, and I am confident it will play a role in ending this war.

It is for that reason, Madam Speaker, that I rise in strong support of the Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act and urge my colleagues support for the Act.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Suspending normal trade relations with Russia is important. It is my belief 20 years from now the part of this bill that will most be remembered is the change in the Magnitsky Act, which is normally used to sanction foreign elected officials.

Right now, the Magnitsky Act can be used only for defined crimes, extrajudicial killings, torture, prolonged detention without trial. We are now opening up that act to unlimited human rights, however defined, including sanctioning people, for example, not following the LGBTQ agenda, or not being sufficiently pro-abortion.

We have heard before this country weighing in on countries like the Dominican Republic, Hungary, African and Latin American countries, using our economic might to punish them when they don't adopt our view or I'd say the liberal view of Christianity.

It is with great disappointment that people held out and risked whether this

bill would go ahead or not on changing the Magnitsky Act.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) whose work on human rights is well known.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, as a member, co-chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I want to compliment Mr. CARDIN and Mr. WICKER and their work on this bill, bipartisan, from the Senate.

What Russia has done with Ukraine is immoral. It is illegal. It is against the word, the acts, the intentions of every godly character ever. God would not have approved. WWJD?

What Russia has done deserves the entire condemnation of the world; and everything we can do to condemn them and put them out of organized civilized society is appropriate because they are not acting as a civilized member of society.

I support this bill. I think there is not too much we can do to Russia. There is not too much that they have done to Ukraine and continue to do in killing children, and disabled, and orphans. They deserve all of the might of the United States that we can put on them and take away from them. We need to punish them with all we have. I support the bill entirely.

Glory to Ukraine.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished majority leader who, again, has been a consistent champion of human rights.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for yielding.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for joining in this effort to ensure that America speaks with a strong and certain voice.

Madam Speaker, yesterday, we heard from President Zelenskyy, an historic address that moved us all. He spoke in an hour of peril for democracy in his country and at a turning point for democracy around the world.

We were, and remain, awed by the courage mirrored by that individual who leads Ukraine, and of the people he leads who, in light of an overwhelming force, said no, we will not yield. We will stand, and we will fight, and we will speak out for our country.

Contrary to the premise of the war criminal who leads Russia saying that they would welcome the Russian troops with open arms. That was a lie, a lie to the Russian people, a lie to the Russian conscripts, and a lie to the world.

Vladimir Putin's criminal and unprovoked invasion of the sovereign nation of Ukraine has only grown more brutal, Madam Speaker, through the days and weeks. We have seen his forces target civilian areas, bomb hospitals, and disappear Ukrainian elected officials in areas they occupy.

This House is being asked today whether to repeal Russia's permanent, normal trade relations status. The question ought to be: Is Russia behaving like a normal, law-abiding nation? And of course, the resounding answer of the world has been no.

Indeed, there is nothing normal about its behavior or about Putin's choices. He has violated every norm that has been in place since the end of the Second World War. He is testing the resolve of the democratic free world. And thankfully, we are meeting that test with unity, with resolve, and with strength.

The revocation of Russia's normal trade status with the United States, as well as that of its ally, Belarus, is just the latest tool, Madam Speaker, being employed to isolate Russia economically and prevent the replenishment of its military assets being depleted in the invasion of Ukraine.

Putin clearly should have envisioned the pain that his invasion would be bringing down on his own country. That is a shame, because it is clear that a large segment of the Russian people do not want this war and, in fact, thousands of them are in jail because they have publicly made that clear.

They don't want to see their children being sent off to kill, maim, and terrorize the people of a friendly neighbor that caused them no threat; whose citizens maintain close people-to-people relations with the Russian people; and they do not want to lose access to the global marketplaces in which many Russian entrepreneurs and innovators have been participating and finding opportunities.

But no, the murderer of Moscow determined that he wanted to see the Russian empire restored, not because he was threatened, not because Russia was threatened, but because it would serve his ego and concept of empire.

□ 1445

As Russia continues to grow more and more isolated, as the vise tightens around its media, as the last few flickers of freedom for its people are extinguished, its people need only look to the Kremlin for answers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.'' Vote ''yes'' for the heroic people of Ukraine. Vote ''yes'' for a leader that has shown us courage and commitment to freedom and to democracy. Vote ''yes'' to tell Vladimir Putin that norms still matter, and we will not stand by as he seeks to break them.

No, normal relations are not warranted.

Vote ''yes.'' Vote for democracy. Vote for freedom. Vote for a courageous people. Vote for a free Ukraine.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as the Bible tells us, to whom much is given, much is required. Every American hearing and watching President Zelenskyy yesterday had to understand so much more is required of us to end this war in Ukraine and to aid the Ukrainian people in their victory over Russia.

This bill takes an important step to defund American revenue that would fund the Russian war machine. It takes an important bipartisan step forward to make sure that Russian products don't enter into the U.S. with the same treatment as the invaded country, as Ukraine's products come into the United States.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to have worked with Chairman NEAL, our Democrat colleagues, and the House and Senate on this measure. I know more must be done to provide lethal aid to Ukraine to continue to expand and strengthen economic sanctions; to bring our allies together; to make sure, in my view, that America takes the necessary steps to replace Russian oil with the cleanest made-in-America energy, oil, and gas here in the United States as well.

But as Congresswoman VICTORIA SPARTZ, a Ukrainian-born Member of Congress, said, this step today is crucial in our defense of Ukraine, the Ukrainian people, and democracy in the world.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as I close, I thank Mr. BRADY for his partnership in this effort to hold Putin accountable and for his support for the Ukrainian people.

I also was moved by the gentlewoman from Indiana's testimony just a few minutes ago about Ukraine when she said this is not normal behavior. This is not the regularization, we hope, of normal behavior, a return to the old Soviet empire.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the terrific work of the Committee on Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee staff, particularly Alexandra Whittaker, Katie White, and Sofia Ferber. Their expertise and dedication made this legislation possible, and I thank them for their contributions.

Madam Speaker, I think in the many years that I have been in this House, one of the most moving moments occurred yesterday when we heard the President of Ukraine, Zelenskyy—duly elected, incidentally—talk about the pain and anguish but also the courage of the Ukrainian people. To witness the bombardment and the murder and killing of innocent children by this Russian dictator, I hope all the world, like this Congress today, will abhor that.

Madam Speaker, it is not enough just to applaud and to talk about the challenges that Russia has presented to the civilized world. We have to do something about it.

Coming on the heels of the oil embargo, I believe this will also receive broad bipartisan support today, and it will swiftly move from Congress to President Biden's desk. There is no time to waste.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7108, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7108.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 8, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—424

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brooks
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Guest
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
Norman
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young

NAYS—8

Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Gaetz
Greene (GA)
Grothman
Massie
Roy

NOT VOTING—1

Zeldin

□ 1529

Messrs. ROY and BISHOP of North Carolina changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bass (Takano)
Bowman (García (IL))
Brown (OH) (Aguilar)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (GA) (Cammack)
Carter (TX) (Nehls)
Connolly (Wexton)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
Cuellar (Correa)
Curtis (Moore (UT))
Dean (Scanlon)
DeLauro (Courtney)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Fortenberry (Moolenaar)
Frankel, Lois (Wexton)
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))
Garamendi (Correa)
Garbarino (Jacobs (NY))
Golden (Courtney)
Harder (CA) (Beyer)
Horsford (Evans)
Jeffries (Kelly (IL))
Johnson (TX) (Aguilar)
Kahele (Mrvan)
Kaptur (Lawrence)
Kim (NJ) (Pallone)
Kinzinger (Meijer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lesko (Miller (WV))
Lofgren (Aguilar)
Maloney, Carolyn B. (Wasserman Schultz)
Neguse (Perlmutter)
Norman (Donalds)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rodgers (WA) (Bilirakis)
Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Rush (Evans)
Ryan (Lawrence)
Salazar (Moore (UT))
Schrier (Aguilar)
Sires (Pallone)
Steel (Obernolte)
Suozzi (Beyer)
Taylor (Fallon)
Titus (Cicilline)
Trone (Beyer)
Upton (Katko)
Wagner (McHenry)
Walorski (Bucshon)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF HONORABLE VICTOR FAZIO, JR.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I think that Members now know that yesterday we lost a wonderful, decent, extraordinary former Member of this body. Madam Speaker, as you know, he was from your State. His name was Vic Fazio. Some of you served with him. Most of you did not. He retired in 1998 from a very successful career.

Many of us in this House, who served with him and who remember him fondly, are grieving the loss of Vic Fazio. He was, until my dear friend BEN CARDIN came to the Congress, my best friend. They were two of my best friends. Vic and I were very, very close. Many others in the Congress of the United States would say the same thing, who served with him, that they were close to him.

Vic Fazio had an extraordinarily successful life. He was 79 years of age.

He was a leader and was a cardinal in the Appropriations Committee from his first year on the Appropriations Committee. He and an extraordinary Republican, who died just 8 months ago, who we remembered on this floor, another dear friend of mine, Jerry Lewis, also from California, co-chaired the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. They did so in a way that enhanced the sense of importance of this institution and of the collegiality that was possible in this institution. We said that when Jerry Lewis died. It is true when his partner now of that era has passed away.

It is an era that we ought to remember and hopefully replicate. Vic Fazio was a ''Member's Member.'' He was an

institutionalist. He cared about each and every one of us, irrespective of the letter next to our name. He cared about process. He cared about substance. He cared about the integrity of Members. He cared about their well-being and how they were treated as Members.

In fact, it was Vic Fazio in 1989 who led the effort to reform the pay and benefits of Members. In that process, at that point in time, Members could make about $25,000 to $30,000 in what was called honoraria. It was a payment from private sector interests to Members for giving a speech.

Vic, and the colleagues with whom he worked, worked together to eliminate honoraria and to make sure, however, that Members could live decently in this town, an expensive town in which to live, with a salary that was appropriate. All of you who get your paychecks can thank Vic Fazio that they are substantially above what they otherwise would have been, but for his and other reformers' actions.

Vic Fazio lost his wife, Judy, and I lost my wife, Judy. Our wives knew one another. I lost mine 25 years ago, and he lost his some years ago. The sadness of his life is that he lost a daughter very early in life, and he never got over that. It was a deep, deep scar in his heart.

The good news is that after the death of Judy, he married a woman whose name is Kathy. I don't know whether Kathy is watching today, but if she is, we send her our love and our sympathy and our thanks for the life of Vic Fazio and the contribution he made to his country, to his State, to our Nation, and to this institution.

To give us an example of wisdom, of acceptance of others, of lifting others up, irrespective of that small letter next to their name, because he knew that all of us were Americans, chosen by our neighbors, which is the only way you can get here, to serve them, to represent their views in this body, and to make weighty decisions on their behalf that will have consequences for them and, as we do today, consequences for all the world.

For 20 years, Vic Fazio was the voice of Sacramento and Yolo County in the Congress. One of Vic's lasting legacies was the designation of 3,700 acres of protected wetlands in Yolo County. Perhaps, Madam Speaker, we can name that territory after Vic Fazio.

He was effective because he reached across the aisle and worked closely with Republicans and, as I mentioned, Jerry Lewis.

When the legislative appropriation bill came to the floor, we were all proud, because it was not a partisan bill. It was a bill for the institution and for the people.

So we remember a man of intellect, of integrity, and a warm and genial nature who was proud of his service, proud of the Congress, and proud of his colleagues.

Madam Speaker, I would ask all of us to rise for a moment of silence to remember a great, great American and great Member of this House, Vic Fazio.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks all Members in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol, to rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the Honorable Victor Fazio, Jr.

FORCED ARBITRATION INJUSTICE REPEAL ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 963) to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. FITZGERALD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BEATTY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 1, printed in House Report 117–273, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 246, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—184

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
DesJarlais
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meijer
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Upton
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

NAYS—246

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClain
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch

Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young

NOT VOTING—2

Kinzinger
Zeldin

□ 1559

Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, and Mr. MEUSER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bass (Takano)
Bowman (García (IL))
Brown (OH) (Aguilar)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (GA) (Cammack)
Carter (TX) (Nehls)
Connolly (Wexton)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
Cuellar (Correa)
Curtis (Moore (UT))
Dean (Scanlon)
DeLauro (Courtney)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Fortenberry (Moolenaar)
Frankel, Lois (Wexton)
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))
Garamendi (Correa)
Garbarino (Jacobs (NY))
Golden (Courtney)
Harder (CA) (Beyer)
Horsford (Evans)
Johnson (TX) (Aguilar)
Kahele (Mrvan)
Kaptur (Lawrence)
Kim (NJ) (Pallone)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lesko (Miller (WV))
Lofgren (Aguilar)
Maloney, Carolyn B. (Wasserman Schultz)
Neguse (Perlmutter)
Norman (Donalds)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rodgers (WA) (Bilirakis)
Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Rush (Evans)
Salazar (Moore (UT))
Schrier (Aguilar)
Sires (Pallone)
Steel (Obernolte)
Suozzi (Beyer)
Taylor (Fallon)
Titus (Cicilline)
Trone (Beyer)
Upton (Katko)
Wagner (McHenry)
Walorski (Bucshon)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BENTZ. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bentz moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 963) to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The material previously referred to by Mr. BENTZ is as follows:

Page 7, beginning on line 22, strike ''dispute or claim that arises or accrues on or after such date'' and insert ''agreement made on or after such date''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BENTZ. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 222, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—208

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young

NAYS—222

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Kinzinger
Zeldin

□ 1619

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bass (Takano)
Bowman (García (IL))
Brown (OH) (Aguilar)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (GA) (Cammack)
Carter (TX) (Nehls)
Connolly (Wexton)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
Cuellar (Correa)
Curtis (Moore (UT))
Dean (Scanlon)
DeLauro (Courtney)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Fortenberry (Moolenaar)
Frankel, Lois (Wexton)
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))
Garamendi (Correa)
Garbarino (Jacobs (NY))
Golden (Courtney)
Harder (CA) (Beyer)
Horsford (Evans)
Johnson (TX) (Aguilar)
Kahele (Mrvan)
Kaptur (Lawrence)
Kim (NJ) (Pallone)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lesko (Miller (WV))
Lofgren (Aguilar)
Maloney, Carolyn B. (Wasserman Schultz)
Neguse (Perlmutter)
Norman (Donalds)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rodgers (WA) (Bilirakis)
Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Rush (Evans)
Salazar (Moore (UT))
Schrier (Aguilar)
Sires (Pallone)
Steel (Obernolte)
Suozzi (Beyer)
Taylor (Fallon)
Titus (Cicilline)
Trone (Beyer)
Upton (Katko)
Wagner (McHenry)

Walorski (Bucshon)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MALINOWSKI). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 209, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—222

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—209

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young

NOT VOTING—1

Zeldin

□ 1638

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bass (Takano)
Bowman (García (IL))
Brown (OH) (Aguilar)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (GA) (Cammack)
Carter (TX) (Nehls)
Connolly (Wexton)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
Cuellar (Correa)
Curtis (Moore (UT))
Dean (Scanlon)
DeLauro (Courtney)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Fortenberry (Moolenaar)
Frankel, Lois (Wexton)
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))
Garamendi (Correa)
Garbarino (Jacobs (NY))
Golden (Courtney)
Harder (CA) (Beyer)
Horsford (Evans)
Johnson (TX) (Aguilar)
Kahele (Mrvan)
Kaptur (Lawrence)
Kim (NJ) (Pallone)
Kinzinger (Meijer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lesko (Miller (WV))
Lofgren (Aguilar)
Maloney, Carolyn B. (Wasserman Schultz)
Neguse (Perlmutter)
Norman (Donalds)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rodgers (WA) (Bilirakis)
Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Rush (Evans)
Salazar (Moore (UT))
Schrier (Aguilar)
Sires (Pallone)
Steel (Obernolte)
Suozzi (Beyer)
Taylor (Fallon)
Titus (Cicilline)
Trone (Beyer)
Upton (Katko)
Wagner (McHenry)
Walorski (Bucshon)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 77, in the Second Session of the 117th Congress, on H.R. 6434, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

LOWERING ENERGY COSTS WITH TRANSFORMATIVE INVESTMENTS

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because my constituents, like all Americans, are paying far too much at the pump. They are angry, and so am I.

In response to Vladimir Putin's unprovoked invasion of Ukraine, President Biden rightly imposed crippling sanctions on Russia to bankrupt Putin's war machine and sever Russia's ties to the global war economy. That was the right move, and Russia is feeling the punishment from those sanctions. But, unfortunately, so are the American people.

The American people are willing to do their part in support of Ukrainians, who are fighting for their survival, fighting for their independence. But the fact is, we are too dependent on foreign autocrats for their oil and gas. It leaves us vulnerable to supply chain constraints and gives tyrants like Putin too much power over our way of life.

But with transformative investments in clean energy and electric vehicles, we could take back control, lower energy costs, and protect our national security.

That is why we need substantial tax credits so that all families can afford electric vehicles. To power them, we must bolster our clean energy production from solar wind and other renewable sources.

These investments will shake our reliance on fossil fuels, create good-paying jobs, and shield us from energy price shocks like we are feeling right now. We simply have no time to waste.

BIDEN'S ENERGY AND INFLATION CRISES

(Mr. ROSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, higher prices at the gas pump directly result from President Biden's actions.

On his first days in office, he canceled the Keystone pipeline; he ended new oil and gas leases on Federal lands; and he is attempting to regulate the industry out of existence by way of executive orders.

But don't worry, President Biden's administration has offered some words of encouragement for Americans struggling to pay outrageous prices at the pump.

Last week, the Secretary of Transportation said to those Americans upset about paying outrageous gas prices that ''communities can all benefit from the gas savings of driving an electric vehicle.''

Did someone forget to mention to the Secretary that the average cost of an electric vehicle is $50,000, which, frankly, is far more than the yearly household income of many middle Tennesseans?

Even Elon Musk, the founder of the electric vehicle maker Tesla, understands that electric vehicles cannot solve this immediate crisis. Maybe he should lead the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one solution to President Biden's energy crisis: reverse these disastrous executive orders and unleash America's energy independence.

□ 1645

SUPPORT THE BLACK AND BROWN MIGRANTS AROUND THE WORLD

(Ms. TLAIB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today in support of Black and Brown migrants around the world. Putin's invasion of Ukraine is horrific, and my heart is with the millions of families who have been displaced and those who have lost their lives.

I must highlight the refugee crisis caused by the war that has exposed a double standard. Black and Brown migrants fleeing Ukraine are being forced to the back of the line and turned away at European borders. This reminds me of what happened this past September at our own border when the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol used excessive force and life-threatening tactics in a racially-charged manner against unarmed Haitians. Simply put, we must demand better.

President Biden and the administration must raise this issue with European leaders at every opportunity, and act to ensure that everyone, regardless of their color, their skin, their faith, and their ethnicity can find safety from this violent conflict.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL RED CROSS MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize March as National Red Cross Month. Since 1943, March has been recognized as Red Cross Month. The Red Cross was founded by Clara Barton in 1881 with the noble mission of preventing and easing human suffering.

Since its creation, the Red Cross has grown to one of the largest organizations in the country. Their efforts span from disaster relief, lifesaving blood collections, international services, and assistance with military families and veterans. In our current state of the world, the Red Cross is actively assisting with humanitarian efforts in Ukraine.

The Red Cross is able to carry out their mission because of their vast and strong network of volunteers, donors, and partners. Whether help is needed in big cities or the smallest towns, the Red Cross is always ready to provide assistance.

Mr. Speaker, during American Red Cross Month, let's renew our commitment to the timeless ideals of caring for one another.

STOP THE WAR IN UKRAINE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today during the debate dealing with removing the normal trade relations from Russia and Belarus, I indicated that ''slaughter'' is too nice a word to describe the actions of Vladimir Putin against the innocent people of Ukraine. I insist on that definition. One Member rose and said it was genocide. Certainly, it is near that devastating and deadly system that we have seen used elsewhere.

As Russian soldiers come home in body bags and as Russian mothers begin to mourn, I make this plea to the Russian people: This is an illegal war. Putin is a war criminal. We can only now count on you. The Western world has done every single thing that they can do to stop the pillage, the violence, the killing of pregnant women, the slaughtering of babies in the street.

It is time now for the Russian people to unleash the shackles around your mind and your hands, to be able to stand up and say to Putin—who is now leading your country into an end that you will never, never, never forget or be forgiven for.

Why don't you stand up and speak eloquently to stop this violence and this war, to ask for peace, to get to the peace table, and make a difference in Russia saving lives, and for the people of Ukraine.

GAS PRICES HIT AN ALL-TIME HIGH

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, gas prices have hit an all-time high, averaging over $4 nationally for the first time since 2008. The rising price of fuel, groceries, and just about everything are an assault on the pocketbooks of working families, and it is all a direct result of President Biden's failed energy policies.

Under the Trump administration we were energy independent for the first time in my lifetime. But within just his first few days in office, President Biden reversed all the progress that we made.

Yesterday, we heard from President Zelenskyy who urged President Biden to do more to support Ukraine as they defend themselves from Russia. While banning Russian oil imports is a vital first step, another way to support Ukraine is by unleashing American energy so we can help make the world less reliant on Putin and dictators who use the profits from oil exports to fund their malign activities.

President Biden would rather pay dictators than Americans all in the name of climate change. What happened to Made in America? For the sake of our Nation and our European allies who could use an alternative to Russian fuel, I hope he listens to the American people—let's make America energy independent again.

REMEMBERING JARED LLOYD

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, March 23 marks 1 year since the tragic passing of my constituent, Jared Lloyd, whose memory I wish to honor today.

Mr. Lloyd was a volunteer firefighter with the Hillcrest Fire Department in the village of Spring Valley, New York, where I grew up. On March 23 of last year, Jared Lloyd died a hero. He sacrificed his life to rescue residents of Evergreen Court Home for Adults from a horrific fire.

Jared's colleagues have said that he saved as many as 30 lives that day. I know that I speak on behalf of the people of Rockland County when I say that I cannot express how incredibly proud I am of him for his bravery and his selflessness, and how sad I am over his loss.

Jared Lloyd was 35 years old. He was a son, a companion, and a loving father of two wonderful children, Logan and Darius. Jared was a schoolmate of mine. He was a graduate of Spring Valley High School. He had so much life left to live. He will never be forgotten. Today, he is remembered in the House of Representatives for his heroic actions.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening as the proud daughter of New Mexico to discuss the transformative impacts of the American Rescue Plan for our State on this beautiful St. Patrick's Day during Women's History Month to highlight the impacts the American Rescue Plan has had for our working families, our kids, and for our entire Nation.

It has been a difficult year—a difficult several years—as our communities have experienced the impacts of the pandemic and the economic struggles that have come with it. When we think back to even a year ago, last year at this time, we were unable to gather safely, unemployment was at an all-time high, so many of our families were struggling, and businesses closed.

One year ago, this body passed the American Rescue Plan. One year later, people are still struggling in our country, and supply chains and our economy are still recovering, but so much has changed. Our economy is growing at a faster rate than at any point since the 1980s. More jobs have been created in 1 year than ever in our Nation's history. Wages are up and more small businesses are opening up across the country than ever before.

Because the American Rescue Plan changed the way in which families put food on the table, provide for their families so that our parents, and women in particular, can return to work and has helped our schools stay open and our families and small businesses stay afloat.

Let's get to the heart of the matter today, which is how this particular piece of legislation has transformed the lives of so many New Mexicans and how our communities have benefitted from these historic policies.

The people of New Mexico, especially our women, are strong, resilient centers of our families, and the roots of our communities. Our women carry us, nurture us, and work hard every day so that we can succeed—like the women in my own life, my own mother, my sister, and the trailblazing women who came before us and support us every day in our communities.

But the challenges and burdens of this pandemic in the past 2 years have fallen unequally and disproportionately on women who have exited the workforce in unprecedented numbers, and on our kids who are resilient, yet still struggling.

As families struggle to make ends meet, keep a roof over their heads, and put food on the table, women have had to dig deep and find creative solutions. These burdens have fallen disproportionately, in particular, on our Latina and Hispano women, on our indigenous women, our Black women, and women struggling economically every day to make ends meet.

There are countless stories of struggle and resilience and survival in our communities and the impacts of the American Rescue Plan. One from New Mexico's First Congressional District is that of April Trujillo and her four boys in Albuquerque.

After losing her husband in September of 2020, Derrick Trujillo, a small business owner, who owned a small carpet cleaning business, their family struggled in a way that they had never done so before. They were ultimately able to keep a roof over their heads and keep food on the table because of the transformative impacts of the child tax credit and rental assistance programs provided by the American Rescue Plan.

It is by no means a stretch to say that these programs helped to catch this family as they faced potentially becoming homeless at one of the most difficult moments in their life. That is exactly what this American Rescue Plan was designed to do and why we must put these transformational investments in childcare, in the child tax credit, in housing, in food assistance, and our community well-being, and continue them into the future.

They catch families like the Trujillo family when they need it most. It will help to lift up Americans who are facing economic struggles and create opportunities for families for generations to come.

As we celebrate the 1-year anniversary of the American Rescue Plan and celebrate the passage of the historic infrastructure package a few months ago, and crucial budget legislation just this last week, these bills have had a transformational impact on our economy, on jobs, and families across the country, and we acknowledge that the work is not over.

We must extend the child tax credit. We must expand programs to tackle housing and hunger. We must invest in a universal childcare system and caring for our elders. We must tackle drought and climate change. We must stand with Ukraine and global democracy. This is the work ahead and we stand together united to get it done.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been taught and told from an African proverb that when a tall tree falls in the forest it makes a lot of noise, it gathers a lot of attention, everybody and every entity in the forest knows that something has happened.

A few days ago, a tall tree fell in the ''Chicagoland'' community where I live. A gentleman, Mr. Pervis Spann, spent the last day of his life. Pervis Spann, to all of us, is known as the ''blues man'' because he was a great artist who projected, promoted, and entertained us for years.

□ 1700

Pervis was born in Itta Bena, Mississippi. Like many other African Americans who were born in Itta Bena, Mississippi, and anyone else in Mississippi, individuals migrated to other places. Thousands and thousands and thousands of them made their way to Chicago, Illinois.

As a matter of fact, we fondly say that the only place where there are more Mississippians than there are in Chicago is in Mississippi itself. Many individuals left the delta area. So did Pervis Spann. He went to Michigan; worked in Gary, Indiana; and joined the military. But eventually he made his way to Chicago.

He came to Chicago and used his GI Bill to go to broadcasting school, and he got to be very good at it, not only as a broadcaster but also as a promoter.

Ultimately, the Stack brothers bought a radio station, and they named that station WVON. Eventually Mr. Pervis Spann, Vernon Jarrett, Wesley South and a woman named Gwendolyn Hayes ended up acquiring the station. Spann was the blues part of it. As a matter of fact, he entertained and promoted, entertained and promoted.

The station also became a pioneer in talk radio. As a matter of fact, before there was talk radio, Wesley South, one of the partners, had a talk radio program called ''On Target''. And this was years and years and years ago. ''On Target''. It is hard to believe that talk now dominates in many places. So WVON was a pioneer of talk radio.

It also has become the powerhouse of communication in the Chicagoland area, especially for African Americans. Talk all day long about whatever is going on in the community, whatever is going on in Chicago, and whatever is going on in the world, WVON. As a matter of fact, many of my neighbors and friends wait to wake up in the morning so that they can listen to WVON especially, beginning at 6:00 o'clock in the morning.

But not only was Pervis Spann a tremendous promoter, but he also was a tremendous businessman period. Ultimately the station came into the hands of his daughter, Melody Spann-Cooper, who has taken it to new heights. If it is not heard on VON, it did not happen if it was not part of the discussion on WVON. So it is much more than entertainment. It is the community's townhall all day long, every day, whatever it is, WVON leads the way.

So I simply wanted to express condolences to his family on his passing and also let his family know how much Pervis Spann has meant to Chicago, how much it has meant to the socialization of the community, how much it has meant to the business promotion of the community, and how much it has meant to the spirituality of the community. On Sunday afternoons there is kind of a gospel-political atmosphere created, so that some people can hardly wait to get home from church so they can turn on VON so they can listen to

the ''Gospel with Pam Morris Walton'' show.

So Pervis may have been the bluesman, and he may have entertained all the greats. Pervis Spann was noted and known as the person who named Aretha Franklin the ''Queen of Soul''. He gave her that designation, and it stuck. So Melody will carry on in the tradition of her father as VON is the voice not just of the Negro—that was what the VON stood for—but the voice of the Nation, WVON, Pervis Spann.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this month is Women's History Month, and we celebrate Women's History Month because of the tremendous progress that has been made.

I am always reminded that when a group of men sat in the room and stated that we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, they didn't really mean all men. They meant some men. They meant the men whom they felt had enough knowledge, enough resources, and enough interests to make decisions for the country. Therefore, all men were not in the room.

As a matter of fact, African-American men who were in slave States were not even considered as a full man. African-American slaves were considered as three-fifths. They had something called the three-fifths compromise which meant that they would only count African-American slaves as three-fifths of a person when they were counting up for the Census, not all men and no women.

As a matter of fact, women didn't get the right to vote in this country until a little more than 100 years ago. Yet, as a result of suffrage, protests, struggle, and changes, now a woman is the Vice President of the United States. So there has been movement, although not nearly enough and not nearly what there has to be. So the struggle will continue so that ultimately there will be levels of equity in this country for women, Blacks, and other citizens who don't have it and have not had it.

The woman that I chose to mention at this time is a woman, Merri Dee, who was an icon in broadcasting and philanthropy. Merri Dee was born in Chicago in 1936, the youngest of six children. She was only 2 years old when her mother died. Her father ultimately became sick and, of course, he had remarried. She was adopted by her stepmother, and she maintained that life was pretty rough for her until she got to the fifth grade and met a wonderful teacher who helped to change her life.

She stated in an interview that this teacher, a Mrs. Robinson, told her that she would be great. She believed in that teacher, and then she went on and became great.

She graduated from Englewood High School, went back to New Orleans and enrolled in Xavier University where she studied business administration. She, of course, dropped out and took a job at IBM to help her other brothers and sisters. She then worked, got married, got divorced, had a daughter, got a good job, and she just felt that she was spending too much time away at her job and from her child, so she quit that job, and somebody told her: You have a gift for gab.

She decided to study broadcasting and journalism.

She did, and she got so good at it, eventually she got her first show, a radio show. She did that for a bit, and then she got a television show, became excellent at it, and became one of the top female broadcasters in the United States.

As a matter of fact, she was so good, she did that, then she ran into a little difficulty. She and one of her guests were kidnapped leaving the show, robbed, shot, left for dead, and with two bullets in her head she crawled up to the highway where someone picked her up, took her to the hospital, and she stayed hospitalized for a year.

As a matter of fact, she was told that she wouldn't make it and had two last rites given to her, one by the Reverend Jesse Jackson who was indeed a friend of hers. But she prevailed and lived and was in the hospital for a year. She came back, got hired by WGN Television, and she became an anchor. She did that for 11 years. Then they asked her to take the job as director of community relations and public affairs and their children's charities, and she did.

She generated $31 million for the charities and for the philanthropic work. She just kept doing it. I have never known anybody who was more open and more giving. I must have gone to at least hundreds of charitable events over the years where Merri Dee was the announcer. She was the facilitator. She was the person making it happen.

So when we design and define what greatness is, Merri Dee was obviously a great woman, a great broadcaster, a tremendous communicator, and a person who could stir audiences and groups and convince people to give thousands of dollars for needy causes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I salute Merri Dee. I salute her, and I revere her. I know that if people go up that way, that she is up there walking among the angels and putting on events and activities and waiting for other people to come.

□ 1715

REMEMBERING HAROLD WASHINGTON

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, finally, I will mention, although it is Women's History Month, I will mention now an African-American male who was a transformative figure in the life, especially of a big city that was the third largest city in the United States of America, a gentleman named Harold Washington, who became the first African-American mayor of the city of Chicago.

Harold, if he was alive now, would be celebrating his 100th birthday. He would be 100 years old.

Harold was a transformative figure in the political life of Chicago. Chicago was known as the city of the big shoulders, known as many things. But it was a patronage-laden city. Patronage guided the politics of Chicago.

For a long time, it had a tradition that if somebody went to city hall or to State government or county government to get a job, the saying was: ''Don't bring nobody, didn't nobody see it,'' basically meaning that unless you had a letter from a ward boss or from some elected official who was part of the system, even if it was a job that you had ten times the qualifications for, you wouldn't get it. You wouldn't get it because you didn't have the hook-up; you didn't have the connection.

We actually convinced Harold Washington, I am sure, to run for mayor. He had become a Member of Congress. He had been the Democratic lead on the voting rights bill. Of course, in the mid '60s and '70s, that was still hot, just as it is hot today.

It is amazing that we can't get the voting rights extension granted, especially when all politicians in this country basically suggest that they believe in democracy, that they believe in democratic principles, and that they believe that everybody should have a right to participate and express themselves. Then we go through this process of wrangling to make it happen.

But somehow or another, there seems to be a block. I don't know; maybe people have changed their minds from what they learned in grammar school or in high school or what they read in the Constitution and all of that. It seems that way.

Nevertheless, Harold Washington was convinced by people like Lou Palmer, people like Vernon Jarrett, people like myself and others, to run for the mayor of the city of Chicago. He said: Well, if you guys really want me to run for mayor, you have got to show it. If you don't show it, I won't do it. You have got to get some people registered to vote, and you have got to raise some money.

I remember sitting in a room in Lou Palmer's basement, eating watermelon, as a matter of fact, about 10 or 12 of us. We then said to Harold Washington: Well, Harold, you can go on to your next meeting. And we set out to generate the conditions and meet the conditions that he had set.

Harold was so astute, such a charmer, such an intellectual, but he also liked to walk the streets and talk to people in the alley and talk to people who other people probably wouldn't.

I never will forget that I had set up a meeting with a bunch of motorcycle riders for Harold to go to, and some of his campaign people didn't want him to come. Motorcycle riders, the Born Losers, the Buzzing Bees, and Dragons. Harold said: I will be there. Of course, he came, and everybody had donned their leather jackets and all those things.

After he got elected, we ended up with some plaques that the motorcycle

riders gave to Harold and to me. I don't know what happened to his. Mine is still around.

But when Harold got elected, the city council organized against him. There were 29 people on the other side and 21 of us. We called it the 29–21. Ultimately, we ended up with a 25–25 split. Every item that came up, there would be 25 votes for it and 25 votes against it. Then, of course, Harold would get a chance to break the tie.

He had such a sense of fairness that he went all over the city assuring every community that they would be treated the same as every other community, that they would get a part of the infrastructure money, that their schools would be prepared, and that their sidewalks would be repaired and fixed.

He became bigger than life. As a matter of fact, when Harold died, people celebrated in the streets and spent days walking through to pay reverence. That is because he helped people understand that government belonged to them, and they did not necessarily belong to government.

When people ask what was the transformation, the transformation was that the patronage system was seriously diminished. The transformation was the greatest participation, in terms of turnout in elections, would occur, because the people felt that they had somebody in the highest office who respected and recognized what they had to say.

Harold would stop on the street and have a townhall, and 15, 20 people would gather around. It wasn't his intent to stop on the street. He just stopped and would spend time.

Someone asked me what was one of my fondest memories or stories about Harold Washington. I told them it was the fact that I drove a car for 19 years. In 19 years, the car had sort of rusted in the floor, and I put a plank there. We were someplace and Harold wanted a ride to tell me something or ask me something, so he told his guys to go ahead and he was going to ride to the next stop with me. When he got in the car, the plank had shifted. He looked down and said: ''What the . . . ''

I said: ''Mr. Mayor, don't worry about that. Just push that plank back over, and you won't even know that there is no floor.''

He said: ''Why don't you buy yourself a car?'' Well, I didn't get one right then. Eventually, I did.

Harold Washington transformed the politics of Chicago. Harold Washington gave being an elected official in Chicago a new meaning, that it was not just about glad handing and backslapping. It was about trying to serve and serving the people.

Harold, you did your job, you did it well, and we pray tribute to you even during Women's History Month.

RECOGNIZING CHICAGO'S UKRAINIAN VILLAGE

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I prepare to close, I can't help but be reminded that I represent a community in Chicago that we fondly call Ukrainian Village. That is because most of the people there are of Ukrainian heritage.

We have a rally every week. We have everything that you can possibly have, with the hope and with the faith that our President, that our country, will stay on the course. We have no doubt that we will continue to protect Ukraine as a part of the humanity that this country, ''My Country, 'Tis of Thee,'' needs to express, because we know that so goes Ukraine, so goes the other countries nearby, and, ultimately, so will go the United States of America.

Ukraine is a part of us. We are a part of Ukraine. Together, I think we will beat back the murderous, cowardly pact. We will be pressed to the wall, but always, as Claude McKay would say, always, always fighting back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

WHAT GOOD HAS BEEN DONE IN THE LAST YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize right now, because I have had a lot of coffee, and I am just cranky today. I am just cranky. I also apologize for those who have to try to keep track. I will, on occasion, try to slow down. I torment them on occasion by talking too fast.

I started to do part of this a week ago and only wanted to do a little part, but we have a 10 o'clock shutdown rule, so I got up against the clock and had to stop. So, God forbid, they let me have the entire hour, which means I brought a whole bunch of boards.

A week ago, I pitched to some of our friends here a really mean, difficult, and absolutely honest question: Tell me something good that has been done in the last year of absolute control of Congress, of the White House, and of, functionally, the levers of our Government. Tell us something good that has been done policy-wise, legislative-wise, that has passed here for working men and women, for the future of my 6-year-old daughter, for people's retirement security, what has actually happened here.

Then I am going to walk through a whole bunch of things where the words, the virtue signaling, the discussion had great language, warm and fuzzy and caring, and it has actually been devastating to poor people, to the working poor.

I don't think they meant to, but the fact of the matter is, at some point, my brothers and sisters on the left have to have a brutally honest conversation with themselves of what their policies are doing.

We are going to start with, being from a border State, immigration. But it is not immigration. It is opening up the border. What has the Democrats' policy, what has this President's policy, on functionally ignoring the border, done to my community in Arizona and to the country.

□ 1730

First, let's also get our heads around the scale of the numbers when you start seeing that border encounters increased 278 percent, functionally, in a year, when you start seeing numbers over 1.7 million crossings, when you start seeing crossings that are in the millions.

But do you remember all the speechifying that was here a year ago? Do you remember how mean the last President was? We are going to be compassionate and loving.

Does anyone here understand the economic concept of first degree, second degree, third degree effects, what you have done to my communities in Phoenix, what you have done to the communities in this country? Let's show the actual math.

Now, I also have an economic premise, and we have done this presentation multiple times. They were written by liberal economists that talked about the two things you do to make the working poor poorer.

Number one was inflation. Well, congratulations. We are going to talk about that.

Number two was open borders, and it was a very simple concept. If you look at the profile of our brothers and sisters who we would categorize—and I hate these categories, but we do them for policy purposes—who are considered the working poor, they are often our brothers and sisters who did not graduate high school, who sell their labor. That is their income.

You open up the border and import millions of individuals who their economic contribution will be to sell their labor. One of these economic papers, written a decade ago, says you have just taken the working poor in the country and made them poor for another decade. One of them talks about that their income, at the end of the decade, will be at least 6 percent lower.

For all those folks that like to preach about compassion, where is the compassion for those who are just grinding it out, trying to survive here? Do you understand that, at some point, the math always wins?

Let's have a little fun here. Here is my premise, and I am going to try to do this on a number of these boards.

You open up the border. We are going to talk about how many of our brothers and sisters and families and the kids in my community and across this country are now dying of fentanyl.

I did a ride-along a month ago with one of my neighbors who happens to be a police sergeant in a portion of north central Phoenix. He is telling me that, a year ago—and I am not going to get

these numbers exactly right. It was like $70 to $100 for that addict to get high, and now it might be $12.

Remember your basic economics classes. When a price crashes, what does that mean? The availability has skyrocketed.

We are also going to talk a little bit about—I have ZIP Codes in my community where the social workers, the charities, some of my churches are telling me homelessness has doubled in 1 year. Have you seen the crime numbers? We have to deal with reality.

Then, we probably should have an interesting conversation. What makes poor communities poorer? If you have made drugs available, if you have flooded the communities with homelessness, if now you have also increased crime—and do you see the death numbers of our brothers and sisters who are dying of drugs?

Are we willing to have a basic understanding—when you make a really crappy decision that we are not going to enforce the border because it is more compassionate, do you understand the cascade of misery that the left has brought to many of their own constituencies?

The fact of the matter is, a lot of these neighborhoods that are suffering this aren't the ones voting for me. But, dammit, I care because their misery should be all of ours, except it is not politically expedient around here because it basically proves the rhetoric: Let's defund the police. Let's defund ICE.

Great job, guys. Look what you did to your neighborhoods. Look what you did to our communities. Look at the misery. Look at the death you brought. And the math will always win.

For every Member and staffer who may be on one of the televisions around this campus, if you are watching, I want you to have the experience I have had where you have to pick up the phone and talk to a mother who had their child die because they thought they were taking some party drug, and it turned out to have fentanyl in it.

That is the misery. And you are on that phone, and the tears are running down, and you are terrified.

I have a 6½-year-old, the greatest gift God has ever given me. I am terrified that this is the society that you get when you put the left in charge.

Did they mean this? The rhetoric doesn't say so, but, dammit, will they actually stop and take a look at the outcome of their decisions?

When you see a 133 percent increase, people in our communities are dying. They come behind these microphones and tell us how they are the ones that care. Fine. Maybe you should be on the next phone call with me when you are talking to that mother. You can explain to them that it was compassion to open up the border and make it so drug prices crash, so now fentanyl comes screaming into my community, and their child gets to die.

There are consequences to really bad policy. It may have been great rhetoric when you had a different President, but the misery has been foisted on our neighborhoods, our suburbs, our communities, and particularly the communities that the Democrats claim they care about.

If you look at what is going on, on the drug overdoses—by the way, I brought this because, believe it or not, for anyone watching, there are rules where I can't reach over here and write on this, so we did something sort of silly. We had to print it and put some tape on it.

There is your number for 2021, and that is only as of October. We don't have the final data. So, congratulations, Democrats. Over 100,000 of our brothers and sisters are dead, of our children, of our next generation. And there are still a couple more months to be added to that math.

I don't believe it is purposeful, but I believe there is an embarrassment of saying, oh, God, what have we done? The number of times around this place you make a policy decision, you campaign on it, it is in your brochures, you have given speeches, and then you find out it crashes and burns and creates more misery, that willingness to get up behind a microphone and say: I am wrong.

I have had a couple of those, where I thought I understood the math. I thought I understood the societal implications. I am waiting.

Now, we did hear a little bit of it. I was optimistic. The President got behind that microphone up ahead of me and said: Let's fund the police.

You could hear the grumbling of a number of our brothers and sisters on this side because they had campaigned on something very different for years.

Now, let's talk about other levels of crime, and this is not my area of specialty. I do Medicare finance. I do trade. I do taxes. I love working on the geeky stuff. Yes, it doesn't get you on television. You don't raise lots of money because you said something crazy, but it is important. It is what keeps the economy going. It is what keeps prosperity, and I believe economic growth is moral.

But we have been working on a side project on the Joint Economic Committee, and here is our outline. What makes people poor?

Well, you get people that say, oh, education, racism. You start looking at the data sets and truly grinding in, and then things we could do something about, and you start seeing things that pop off the data if you are willing to open your eyes and own a calculator.

Diabetes actually pops off as one of the top things when you see the concentrations of our brothers and sisters with diabetes.

When you actually see crime—and this is one that almost is never talked about here. Communities often that have the most economic misery, is it a chicken and the egg? It is a little hard to get ahead in life when people keep stealing stuff or killing your family members.

Maybe it is time. Reagan, back in the 1980 election, had something called the misery index. It was, functionally, inflation and unemployment. Maybe it is time we could do something much more effective and create the Biden and Democrat-controlled misery index. We could just lay out how many of our brothers and sisters are OD'ing, how many of our brothers and sisters are dying, how many of our brothers and sisters are victims of crime, how many of our brothers and sisters are sicker today, how many of our brothers and sisters now have mental health issues because they spent a couple of years locked up, how many of our kids are almost afraid to take their masks off now.

Think about the sort of psychodrama that this place has foisted on the citizens of this country. And the hits keep coming.

Look, I put this one here more just as a—and I know I am being a bit snarky, but I have to get it off my chest. The number of get-togethers I had a year ago, so during 2020, and fussing and screaming: Why aren't you doing more about COVID? If we had Democrats in charge, people would be healthier. We would solve the problem.

Do you remember President Biden's campaign promises? Do you remember the Democrat leadership's promises here? Put us in charge. We will take care of it.

So, a time where there are therapeutics, a time where there are vaccines, you did a great job, guys, a great job. Because do you see the math? A hell of a lot more of our brothers and sisters died in a time where we actually had the tools.

What happened? My argument is rhetoric sure does sound a lot better than actually explaining competence.

Now, let's talk about—in my 8 minutes I had last week, it was basically trying to have a conversation of what the Democrats have done making the environment worse. And you go, huh?

The fact of the matter—and I will show you the slide here in a moment. As soon as the Biden administration took over—but it even goes back to 2018 when the Democrats won the House.

They basically set off a campaign or jihad, whatever colloquialism you want to use, and it wasn't, hey, we are just going to cancel pipelines. What was it? In 2020, President Biden, in a debate with BERNIE SANDERS, said there will be no more permitting. No more permitting of pipelines. No more permitting of wells. It was an absolute promise.

Well, to his credit, he kept his promise. But did anyone stop for a moment to think about what they were going to do?

So, functionally, what is ESG? I can give you the quote, or we can just do something really simple. It is when you

basically add such a risk premium to investing in any type of hydrocarbons.

So, you are a pension system, you are our pension systems, you are the California teachers, you are a mutual fund, you are an index fund, and you are going to now have to, with all the threats and things coming through the administration—this isn't votes. This isn't a proclamation from the President. This is the infrastructure of our society and our financial markets basically raising a risk premium for investing in natural gas, for investing in the infrastructure of hydrocarbons. Well, what happens?

□ 1745

What happens when you do that? Because remember, it wasn't the invasion of Ukraine by Russia. Go back to last September and October when natural gas prices shot off the charts, and there were people here coming—people on the left—you know, attacking hydrocarbon and natural gas companies. But the fact of the matter is, we were talking about how miserable this winter was going to be, what was happening to your fuel prices.

And look, I have never actually seen heating oil. I am from the desert. I have lived in the desert my entire life. I have seen pictures of it. And then you see people saying it is two, three, four times more expensive for these people to heat their homes, and then you also realize the ZIP Codes they live in and who they vote for. They voted for it.

But the reality of it is, there is a punch line here. When Democrat policy drove up the price of natural gas so high that power generation all across North America converted back to coal, you realize the United States burnt 23 percent more coal last year.

I mean, did anyone just do the basic math? Okay. You are going to engage in policies that make natural gas dramatically more expensive. The next least expensive fuel, all of a sudden, became coal. Congratulations.

Now, during President Trump's time, the use of coal—and this was a guy who claimed to be a coal supporter—went down dramatically because natural gas crashed in price. Remember, the last 15 years, the movement we had to become dramatically less carbon-centric, you know, greenhouse gas formula, heading towards—for those who cared about the math on the Paris accords, was almost exclusively, exclusively the use of natural gas because, remember, we took off so much baseload nuclear, we took off more baseload nuclear in the United States in the previous 15 years than we actually did produce new photovoltaic and wind. So if someone says, oh, it is because of all the clean energy generation. No, it is actually because of natural gas displacing coal. I mean, the math is the math.

This one we need to share. Anyone notice if you were here—and this is even for the poor staff here, please don't move your eyes or anything because someone will take a shot at you for it—a couple weeks ago, before the State of the Union, we came to the floor here, we had to wear masks. Then we all hear about polling being done by the White House and the Democrat leadership, and all of a sudden, we find out, hey, turns out the public is over it, even Democrat-based voters are pretty much over the enforcement of mask mandates, and did you notice pretty much a little bit after the Impact Research poll that the Democrats did, 48 hours later after the poll was published, guess what happened? I don't have to wear a mask on the floor anymore.

Policy by virtue signaling instead of a calculator, it is theater. Welcome to how this Congress has been run. It happened. It happened. Look, I am not the only one to point this out. Even a number of leftist publications said: Isn't it just amazing, as soon as the Democrats got a poll that it no longer was popular even with their base, all the masks come off?

Even the people, even the experience of a couple of the Democrat matriarchs that fussed at me not to get into an elevator with them because I wasn't wearing a mask in the hallway, which I was very respectful, I didn't, 48 hours later didn't care that I was in the elevator with them without a mask because the polling said it was okay. I am happy to know we now make public health policy on the Democrat side with polling. But it is real. It happened.

So let's actually have a little bit more fun here. The absurdity of Democrat policy. Guess when statutorily—the Democrats passed this about 3 weeks ago, they set a date. They set a date when the pandemic will be over. Not based on science, not based even on their polling. They set a date. Congratulations, it is September 30, 2025.

Two years ago, when we were actually working together on this, we had a collective understanding we were worried that emergency rooms, hospitals were going to be just packed, we wouldn't have enough ventilators, we were racing for vaccines. We didn't have antivirals. But there was, I thought, a collective societal that we declare a pandemic.

Do you remember 15 days to slow the spread? We will all stay home for 15 days, slow the spread. And here we are a couple years later. We have antivirals; we have vaccines; we have therapeutics; we understand the virus; and the policy set is to make September 30, 2025.

Now, we should actually let whoever is watching know the joke. It is about the money. This place is always about the money. There are lots and lots and lots of special spending line items that come with the declaration of a pandemic, and this pretty much locks in saying, hey, you know, this person may hate vaccine passports or hate masks or this and that, but wink wink, nod nod we have made sure the declaration of the pandemic is until 2025 so we can keep getting the largesse of the SPIFs on the cash. If that is what it is, tell the truth. Say, look, you know, we buy our elections by handouts through our policies here. Okay. But tell the truth.

I have a personal fixation on diabetes, and I have done speeches, presentation after presentation on this, and I want to walk through why. Look, we will come back to this two or three times.

This slide, the numbers are much higher now because this slide is from a year ago because the CBO, Congressional Budget Office, hasn't given us an update. But 29 years from now, we are scheduled to have $112 trillion of borrowing, and that is in today's dollars, so adjusted for inflation. Functionally, 75 percent of that spending is Medicare. 31 percent of all Medicare spending is diabetes. 33 percent of all healthcare spending in the United States is diabetic related. I represent, I believe, the second highest percentage of population, one of my Tribal communities that I represent—I love them dearly—they are number two in, we think the world, in the percentage of their members who have diabetes, and their sister Tribe is number one.

Come to my community sometime. I will take you out in the community, introduce you to some of the families I have known my whole life, and grandma has her foot cut off.

So the President did something a lot of people cheered for: Hey, insulin is outrageously expensive, we are going to subsidize it. Okay. Fine. Fine.

Does anyone on the Democrat side actually read any of the healthcare, the pharmaceutical, the science journals? The facility is almost up and running where it is a co-op. If they actually cared about crashing the price of insulin, someone would have paid attention that it is already here. This stuff is about to roll out.

A number of the pharmacies and hospitals got together and said: Screw this, we are going to use a market. We are going to go around, and we are going to make it ourselves, and we are going to do direct sales. They are talking about no more than $30 per vial, $55 per box. It is not requiring government subsidies, regulations, because you know how efficiently that works: We will subsidize it, but the cost of the bureaucracy to do it will be a nightmare.

But does anyone pay attention? I was here about 3 weeks ago talking about if the left really wants to be compassionate—and I can get my brothers and sisters on the right to be loving and compassionate—we know how to cure type 1, at least that is what the science journals are saying. We have figured out how to take a stem cell and direct it to become—I always mispronounce it—an islet cell to produce insulin. There is now even a new version where the taking of that cell and adjusting it with CRISPR so the body doesn't see it as foreign so you can actually have a constant line.

Wouldn't it be miraculous if you actually had some thinking people here

that said: Screw this, instead of patching up people's misery, we are going to subsidize insulin so you can live in misery, just cheaper?

And back to my previous comments that we have been working on a model about what creates income inequality, what creates poverty? We are actually seeing health and crime and these things. Hold it. We know diabetes is actually for our brothers, the urban poor, my Tribal poor, rural poor, is truly everywhere. If you cared, wouldn't you throw everything you have at this concept of, okay, we know how to cure type 1?

The articles, if you read through them—and some of it is thick—is, yeah, the same concept, you could take someone with type 2 and get their body to produce insulin again, but you would actually have to have them engage in much healthier life practices. Would we be willing to have the really brutal conversation here of we are going to change how the farm bill works, we are going to change how nutrition support works, and those who would actually like to see a future where their diabetes type 2 is cured, would they be willing to work with their community to eat different? Would we be willing to work on that? Would we be willing to deliver, have Lyft deliver food boxes to the home and say we are loving, caring about your future and your health, and we don't want you to be like the grandma who is a friend of mine who has had her foot cut off? And if you will do this, the societal trade will be, we will do the stem cell to islet cell to get your body back to producing insulin.

And, oh, by the way, diabetes is the single biggest contributor to U.S. sovereign debt. So for those who are fiscal hawks, great. For those who actually give a darn about people, wonderful.

And, instead, our solution coming from our President standing right there is: I am going to subsidize insulin. I am not going to cure the misery; I am just going to make it cheaper. Where's the vision here?

So now let's actually go back to the previous, the two things you do most to make the working poor poor. Okay. We talked about opening the border, making them compete with others with similar skill sets. My numbers are already out of date because it keeps getting worse. You also crush them by making everything they buy—because if you are poor, if you are that working middle class, if you are just hard-working middle class, the amount of your income that goes to food, the amount of your income that goes to rent, the amount of your income that goes to driving is substantially more than the vast majority of the people in this body.

The income we are paid, we are in the top quartile. And then we also have some of the richest people you can imagine that are here, and it is always funny hearing them talk about—when they are worth millions and millions and millions of dollars, but to the family that is struggling out there, this has been a really crappy year.

I will point it out, and I am going to do it a couple times. Guess which community had the highest inflation rate in the United States? Mine. I had 10.9 percent in my neighborhoods. You want to talk about kicking people in the head? That is year over year. This is what unified Democrat government has brought you. You are poorer today than the day Joe Biden took office.

And then the hallmark here used to be, well, the gap between the rich and poor, income inequality. Well, guess what? That gap, particularly in 2018, 2019, was the greatest shrinkage in modern economic times. 2018, 2019, the fastest movement of the poor getting less poor, the fastest movement of food insecurity shrinking. Congratulations, Democrats, you have done a great job.

It turns out income inequality really started to expand last year. Inflation crushing people. Except if you own lots of assets. If you are one of the rich people here, and you have multiple houses, you have lots of stocks and bonds, you have other things, you got richer or at least your assets went up in value.

□ 1800

Does anyone else see the cruelty going on here, or does it just not fit because you have a pasty White guy here giving the speech?

But the math is the math. I mean, at some point the math will always win.

And my brothers and sisters in the Phoenix area—now, Phoenix is a big community. Remember, Maricopa County is the fourth most populous—I still think we are catching up with Harris County, but fourth most populous county in the country. It is functionally almost seven congressional districts.

And my brothers and sisters in the Phoenix area had a 10.9 percent inflation year over year. Go talk to those families and explain to them how, hasn't this been a great year for you? Aren't you happy you voted for this?

And then you start to look at some of the other data. And I have got to give the left credit. They have done one thing that I didn't think could happen. I am seeing some polling coming out of my community where, not by a little bit, but by almost double digits, Hispanic voters are now going to vote for Republicans. And then you see this and you start to understand why.

Look what has happened, particularly to the African American and Latino voters—or the population, what has happened to their rents? 28 percent increases. They may have thought Democrats were their protectors, but Democrats have basically been their tormentors because the policies have been so badly designed.

And when they were voting for these, we stood here and explained, do you understand what you are about to set off? And the arrogance—well, in a weird way, thank you. It looks like now the Hispanic vote may actually be Republican. Is it because we are so wonderful, or their policies have been so brutal to those communities?

So let's have the hits keep going. The United States—you have heard this over and over and lots of other people have come here and talked about this, but it is worth saying again.

What happens when a nation has the ability to be secure in its energy? What happens to a nation when you are Germany; when you are basically beholden to someone else's hydrocarbons?

And there is one here, and I am going to do this a little bit out of order because I find it absolutely fascinating. We should do this one two or three times. Now we understand that a decade, a decade and a half ago, the protests in Germany, and now we find out much of the activism here, the researchers, the reporters, the journalists that actually do investigative, hey, this stuff may have been financed by countries that sell hydrocarbons. I can't imagine who that would be.

But we now know the stories in Germany—you have seen the stories of the suitcases of cash going to their green movement to shut down their base load nuclear, and Germany today is dramatically dirtier in greenhouse gases than they were 10, 15 years ago because they are living on Russian hydrocarbons and coal.

And I think out of the 20-plus nuclear facilities, I think they have one facility and they are scrambling to find out can they put them back into service. It turns out, same concept here.

I would love for our brothers and sisters on the left to help us actually do an investigation of who has been financing these shut down the pipelines, shut down much of the—particularly natural gas, which I have a great fondness for natural gas because of its miracle on reducing greenhouse gases.

But it looks like much of that part of the green movement may have been financed by countries that could care less about the world's global warming. But it was more about market constraints so they could sell more of their product.

And once again, we had become energy independent. We had become an exporter. The Biden administration takes over, and all of a sudden, the extortion games begin. The threat games begin. You start to find out you are going to be invested by the Securities and Exchange Commission because you may not have disclosed your global warming impact on your investments.

And then you wonder why it was actually months ago that natural gas prices went through the ceiling. I was going to say exploded, but that is a really bad pun. It is in the charts. It wasn't an invasion of Ukraine. It was the election of Democrats really, really screwing up policy.

And now, we don't actually have a complete answer on this. I am hoping it is purely for technical reasons because a couple of weeks ago I did a couple of charts here showing how much

base load nuclear is coming offline. And the fact of the matter is when that comes offline, even with adoption of all the clean energy, all the photovoltaic, all the wind, we actually are upside down. We will have to actually use more hydrocarbons.

And then you hear the story this week that the Feds have rescinded license for a Florida facility that is under construction, which I understand there are stunning amounts of capital already sitting there. I hope this is temporary.

But you would think this would be the type of thing we would be struggling, saying we really want non-carbon emitting base load power in this country. Except for the fact of the matter is—and it is reality—photovoltaic, wind, they write a lot of checks to the Democrats.

It is a dark thing I say, but the fact of the matter is, I can walk you through policy after policy after policy here where it seems to be chasing—I mean, look at H.R. 1 and the other things that this place has passed which had ultimately nothing to do with access to voting. It had to do with building a model that elects Democrats.

I mean, financing Democratic campaigns with six to one money; industrializing ballot harvesting because they have the networks to do that? I mean, it is just—

But, once again, we virtue signal. We say pretty words, and then just hope that the public never finds out what is actually underlying in the real piece of legislation.

And back to what I said before, congratulations Democrats. You burned 23 percent more coal last year.

Yes, I am from Arizona. We are one of the photovoltaic—I mean, it is a Holy Grail where we are. Power actually almost goes to zero for two, three, four hours in the afternoon because we produce so much. But let's get the policies right.

We need storage. There are some breakthroughs in storage now. I have a fascination with the rust iron battery. It doesn't work in a car because it is really big, really heavy, but it works in a utility scale.

But will the left take responsibility that they say one thing and the proof, they burnt 23 percent more coal last year. They made greenhouse gases worse. Pretty rhetoric isn't good math.

And the movement of natural gas—so the folks that say we have got to stop pipelines; have you seen what the pipelines actually look like in the United States? They are everywhere.

So the brain trust here raises lots of money; does lots of campaigns. We are going to cancel something like Keystone so they can put the oil on railcars, or maybe shove it out to the West Coast of Canada so it can be shipped to Asia? Because heaven knows, when they crack it, refine it, they do it in a really clean, well-regulated, EPA-controlled facilities, right?

It had nothing to do with what was good for the environment. It had to do with what was good for raising money.

And now the brain trust gets to deal with the mess they have created policywise. So now we get to see great stories that we are out visiting Venezuela. We are out visiting other countries that functionally are either—I accept the humiliation. Let's take the humiliation.

But if my brothers and sisters over here are truly committed to their green agenda, aren't they just horrified that the decision and policies that they have set up have actually made the environment worse, and now we are actually going to go to countries that actually do it in a filthy fashion.

Huge global warming impacts in the way they pull their hydrocarbon, and that is actually who we are reaching out to to ask for their help.

Of course, I think the real reality, the reason they do is because they have an idea what is about to hit them this election cycle because they have made working men and women's lives, the hard working men and women's lives in this country more miserable, and they are pedaling as fast as they can to find a way to back off the damage they have done.

So let's also see the efficiencies. Remember, we are going to have an administration with no drama. We are going to bring professionalism back.

Well, great. Passport backlog now at 2 million. VA claim backlog over a quarter million. IRS returns backed up over 24 million. SSA hearings, taking functionally almost a year.

Tell me something—so back to my opening question, give me something, anything, one thing that unified leftist control of this government has done to make people's lives better; to make the future of this country better? It has been like a misery factory.

And then, the next board, I want to point out, and it is just one of dozens of examples, but it is for people out there who may be paying attention to understand what is said over there has nothing to do with what they actually do.

So remember the build back better, you had the Speaker and the President and their spokespeople, well, if we spend all this money, if we engage in this policy, it will be good for inflation.

Mr. Speaker, can you tell me my time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, so, tucked into—now here is the great irony. So we found this, tucked into their thousands and thousands of pages of build back better, because, remember, on one hand, they are telling you, hey, we are going to make things more efficient. We are going to actually help reduce inflation. Oh, except for the way that if you actually find out it is a bunch of pandering to the unions, and they made it so you can't automate ports. Huh?

So you are giving us speeches about how the supply chains are the real responsibility for inflation, and build back better is supposed to help inflation, except for you have done the very things that will make it so just the opposite happens. You have made it so I can't automate ports legally anymore.

So all this money, your largesse, you are going to throw out will go to green stuff at ports, but you can't make it more efficient.

You lied to the American people. And how many of my brothers and sisters on the left even knew these sorts of little land mines were tucked into. I mean, they had the unionization of all the government employees in my State if they want the largesse money for family and medical leave; yet they had to do it through a collective bargaining agreement.

The legislation was pandering to those who financed their campaigns, and it would make people's lives more miserable.

I mean, think of that. Inside their build back better was you can't automate ports. You can't make this stuff up.

And then you start to realize, why do we have so many unfilled jobs? Something went horribly off the rails here.

When we functionally—and I need to update this chart because apparently the number is actually even worse.

But we have—I have a fixation on demographic issues. I have done lots of presentations here on the floor, because demographics are actually the primary driver of our U.S. sovereign debt, and Democrat policies continue to make the policy sets around that worse.

So we have 1.5 million more of other brothers and sisters who have said, I quit, I am out of here, I am taking early retirement, I leave, than we expected. Instead of encouraging our brothers and sisters to stay in the economy because we have got to step up productivity because if we don't step up productivity, we can't start to knock down inflation.

Remember, what is inflation? It is too many dollars chasing too few goods.

There is a couple of ways you attack inflation. You can squeeze down the money supply, and you saw that happen with interest rates starting to go up. Or you could also do what Reagan did in 1981. People forget this. Paul Volcker is jacking up interest rates and jacking up interest rates.

Congress, a Democrat Congress at that time, also did a tax cut, a tax reform to try to make business more productive so they would make more stuff. Remember, too many dollars chasing too few goods and services; make more goods and services.

□ 1815

Then, when you are driving people out of the workforce, how do you make more goods and services? Get the policy sets right.

You say you care about inflation, you care about it crushing working men and women, and then you do the very things that continue to make it worse in a society.

When we get through this period of misery, we still have the thing that wipes us out as a society, leads us to decades of misery. The current calculation basically says, in 29 years, my new math says we get to be about 210 percent of debt-to-GDP. That is publicly held debt.

Remember, last year, we were borrowing functionally $47,000 a second. I know most of this place just cares about surviving the next election. I mean, look at the legislation that keeps being offered. But is there at all a moral responsibility here to understand this destroys your kids, this destroys your grandkids, this destroys the future generations? We will be handing the next couple of generations a much poorer—they will live poorer—country than we inherited.

This is $112 trillion of publicly borrowed money adjusted for inflation. This isn't my math; this is CBO's math from a year ago. This is before the crazy spending of last year.

Mr. Speaker, when I came to the mike, I shared with you I was a bit cranky, and I had had a lot of coffee. I don't believe Democrats are evil. Misguided, yes, but I believe many of them are my friends. They have good hearts. But you have to stop the policies that hurt people. You have to stop hurting people, and you have to stop making the Nation poorer.

There are a number of us whose ideas, that aren't even traditionally Republican, we could embrace. I mean, curing diabetes is one of them. Is that Republican or Democrat? It is neither. It is just moral.

Maybe, once in a while, let a Republican have an amendment or an open debate because there is a path. There is a path where we can make our future better, but you have to stop the bloodletting.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to go back and have some decaf.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

AMERICA IN CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about America in crisis, and it is crisis after crisis.

The American people can hardly get their feet underneath them. You see, after riots, the next thing that came was COVID, and then elections, and now more COVID mandates, masks, more COVID, and now, potentially, the thoughts of war.

But there is a lot more happening on top of that. We are in a real crisis in America, especially with American energy. You see, right now, the number one call I receive in my office from my constituents—and it is mainly the only thing they are calling about—is the price of gas.

The price of gas, the average right now, is $4.32. People calling my office are saying they can hardly afford to fill up their tank. They are not sure if they are going to be able to fill up their tank to take their kids to school, to be able to go to the grocery store and afford the high cost of food now. They are just not sure where this is going.

They also call and say they don't understand why the Biden administration, why Congress, why our Federal Government isn't doing anything to help Americans be able to pay for gas at the pump.

You see, it wasn't too long ago that we were energy independent in America. There was a different mindset in charge. There was a mindset of putting our country first, our tax dollars first, putting Americans first, and considering ramping up energy in America and growing energy in America instead of declining and killing energy in America.

But now, that seems to be the way of our government. It is hurting Americans, and people cannot afford it. This should not be a political issue. This is an issue for every single person that drives a car and truck.

Now, it seems to be the goal is to make every single American drive an electric vehicle. If that is the goal, there is a big problem here. It is not up to the government, the United States Government, to force people to buy an electric vehicle. It should be up to the United States Government to do things like take care of our national security, secure our border, help oil companies produce more oil to increase energy independence, increase natural gas production, continue to build more nuclear, to grow energy in America. But that doesn't seem to be the way.

No, we are looking at the third straight week in a row of over $100 a barrel of oil. Currently, it is at $112.12. This is a disaster.

In March 2020, President Trump directed the Department of Energy to purchase 30 million barrels to begin filling our strategic reserves. But President Biden announced in his State of the Union that he would once again tap the strategic reserves and release 30 million barrels of oil in a desperate attempt to reduce gas prices here at home.

Now, Biden is considering releasing even more. This follows an SPR release of 50 million barrels of oil in November 2021, which did nothing to prevent the spike in gas prices. And, no, it is not what is happening in Ukraine. This was happening before Ukraine.

The SPR is supposed to be used for national security emergencies and major weather events. These are our emergency oil supplies. But that doesn't seem to be the case here. It seems to be the continuing plan to reduce America into being dependent on foreign countries.

You see, the biggest problem started on day one when the Keystone XL pipeline was completely stopped. That would have supplied 830,000 barrels of oil from Canada to U.S. refineries. That would have helped Americans once that was finished. But, no, that was an executive order by President Biden to suspend it, to suspend all oil and gas leasing on Federal lands and waters. That was a continued America last energy plan.

While a Federal judge ruled the leasing bans to be illegal, the Biden administration has issued zero new leases on Federal lands. That is not helping Americans.

Another issue that happened in May 2021, President Biden removed sanctions against Nord Stream 2, which were previously put in place by former President Trump. In February 2022, President Biden reversed course and reimposed the Trump sanctions, noting the overwhelming incentive to move away from Russian gas.

President Biden's far-left socialist agenda, Build Back Better, was an effort to cripple domestic energy by increasing oil and gas production payments to 20 percent, increasing bonding and surety requirements to more than 15 times their current levels, imposing a new severance tax, and establishing new annual fees of $10,000 per mile for offshore pipelines.

President Biden's fiscal year 2022 budget request explicitly opposed funding the construction or maintenance of projects that would lower the cost of gas, diesel, or energy derived from fossil fuels.

Biden's Department of Energy has slow-walked liquefied natural gas exports that could reduce Europe's dependence on Russia.

These are all the things that have led to the increase of the price of gas at the pump that is hurting my constituents in my district in northwest Georgia. This is hurting Americans. None of these things have helped us.

Now, here is what we have to consider. We also have bigger problems. The Consumer Price Index, which is a key inflation index, hit a 40-year high in February. The CPI increased to 7.9 percent over the past 12 months, and this is inflation that happened before Russia invaded Ukraine. You can't blame Putin for that one. This is all happening right here at home.

Let's talk about inflation and how it is hurting Americans. Here is one thing that everyone can understand. Used cars and trucks are up 41.2 percent; 41.2 percent is unbelievable.

If you have been on vacation lately, you know that if you try to rent a car or truck, they are very hard to find.

Gasoline is up 38 percent.

Lodging away from home, going to a hotel while you are trying to go on vacation, or, say, people that are traveling for business, that is up 25.1 percent.

Now, if you are cooking at home and trying to save money making a meal

for your family, bacon is up 18.8 percent. Peanut butter, for those great peanut butter and jelly sandwiches that moms and dads make for kids' lunches, is up 15.6 percent. Pork is up 14 percent.

Clothing is up. Dresses are up 13.5 percent.

Airline fees are up 12.7 percent.

The cost of a new vehicle is up 12.4 percent. If you are in the market for a truck, well, guess what? You will have a hard time getting one, or an SUV, because many of them are sitting on the lots, still waiting for microchips.

Eggs are up 11.4 percent. Coffee is up 10.5 percent. Baby food is up 8.4 percent.

Transportation services are up 6.6 percent.

Beer is up. You know there is a problem when the cost of beer is up 5.3 percent.

Now, 2021 went down as the worst year for inflation since 1981, but it looks to be 2022 is going to be worse. The problem for Americans is, it is not that anyone is increasing their wages. They are actually being hurt by all of these economic forces that are hitting American families hard.

Don't forget, the same people that were big Democrat voters, which are those people suffering with big student loans, these are people that are working their jobs, trying to pay their student loans, trying to afford their car payments. They can't afford gas at the pump, and no one seems to be helping them.

Inflation is a tax on everyone, and no one is exempt. That is what people are complaining about here in America, not what the people that run around Washington think. It is a lot different when you talk to people on the ground.

Now, another thing people are very upset about is what is happening at our border. We have a true border crisis, and it is time to start caring about it.

Listen, it is an insult to all border communities because President Biden visited Texas but continued to refuse to visit the southern border or other surrounding communities that his failed open border policies have endangered.

The real issue is, while President Biden is more interested in working with Iran, Russia, and China to go reenter an Iran nuclear deal, he doesn't seem to care about what is happening at the border.

According to Customs and Border Patrol data, there were 153,941 migrant encounters at our southern border in January. That is a 96 percent increase from the previous year. This was the second-worst January on record. Of the 153,941 illegal immigrants encountered at the border, the Biden administration released 62,573 of them into the United States.

This new data comes at a time when ICE deportations are down 70 percent from 2020, the fewest number of deportations in 5 years. This equates to an average of just 100 deportations a day, even as Border Patrol agents encountered up to 7,000 illegal immigrants daily.

But only 100 get deported? Why? You have to ask why.

Since Biden took office, over 2 million illegal immigrants have been apprehended at our southern border. Biden has still not visited the border even during this historic crisis. It doesn't seem that President Biden even cares.

Border officials have estimated that nearly 400,000 illegal immigrants have escaped into the United States without being caught under President Biden. But we don't even know if that is the right number. That is just an estimate.

Out of 104,171 migrants issued notices to report by ICE between the end of March and the end of August 2021, 47,705 failed to report. They just don't bother showing up.

□ 1830

There were 10,763 arrests of migrants with criminal convictions in fiscal year 2021; that is up 2,438 from fiscal year 2020, and that is up 4,269 in fiscal year 2019.

But here is the real issue. Fentanyl is flowing across our borders. Seizures of fentanyl increased by 134 percent in fiscal year 2021 under President Biden's watch.

Now, fentanyl is the number one reported reason of cause of death for young people ages 18 to 45. What are we doing in our country when this deadly drug is flowing across our wide-open border that our President doesn't even seem to care about, that no one is interested in closing the border or securing the border?

How are we failing Americans and failing young people, where fentanyl that comes over from China is so easily flowing across the border? This is a disaster. It is a complete disaster.

Now, what I find absolutely mind-boggling is how here in Congress we passed a $1.5 trillion omnibus bill last week that was 2,741 pages, and we didn't even have 24 hours to read it. That is a complete failure to the American people and the American tax dollars who are the ones paying the $1.5 trillion for the omnibus bill.

There is not a company or a small business in the private sector that operates this way. But our Federal Government is reckless and out of control, and the American people are feeling the consequences. You just have to ask the question: Why? Why does Congress work this way? It is just not working. It is not working for the American people.

Now, this week we were addressed by President Zelenskyy and the crisis that the Ukrainian people are going through. It was heart-breaking to hear the stories he told, the video that he showed, the tragedies that we are hearing about over and over, but we also aren't given enough information.

Last week, Congress approved $13.6 billion to go to Ukraine. Now, this is after years and years of sending billions of dollars in aid to Ukraine and funding all kinds of things in Ukraine. Who does Congress work for? I think that is the greatest question. What is the purpose of this institution where we take American taxpayers' dollars and send it to countries all over the world? We send money to all kinds of foreign countries and fund all kinds of things.

Now, one of the most fascinating stories that went on and on across the internet and news companies—you heard it on TV and saw it on social media everywhere—was this big discussion about biolabs. Now, I thought it was pretty fascinating, a lot of people were interested in it, but we were all told no, no, no, you can't talk about biolabs because that is fake news, that the United States doesn't fund biolabs in Ukraine—the United States wouldn't do that.

Well, come to find out, in fact, it is true. The same news companies and the same sources are telling us that it is not true that the United States funds biolabs—you could also look up their older news stories from years ago where, in fact, they were talking about the United States funding biolabs. So the misinformation going on is real and the American people deserve to know what they are paying for.

This comes on the heels of after 2 years—and this is just so tragic—that not only the United States but the entire world has been dealing with COVID–19. Now, it has been a true tragedy what has happened with COVID. Over 968,000 Americans have died—that is according to The New York Times today—over 6 million people have died worldwide. That is according to The New York Times today.

For the last 2 years, Americans have dealt with the consequences of U.S. funding these labs and funding the gain of function research. Now, it is something that we really have to recognize and we have to talk about, but our government did fund the gain of function research. We know that to be true through EcoHealth Alliance.

The gain of function research is what allowed the virus that is transmitted between bats to be turned into a virus—like a Dr. Frankenstein virus—that can be transmitted between humans. We have to ask the question: Why would the United States Government engage in funding something as horrific as that? How is that science? It is a good thing to ask these questions.

Now, here is what else is interesting. Just today Dr. Fauci, who happened to be the one to help fund the gain of function research, decided to come out and say that mask mandates should be brought back. This is at a time where we are finally getting rid of mask mandates. He is also recommending a fourth COVID vaccine shot.

Now, I don't know about you guys but many of us were vaccinated as kids against polio, we had our MMR, and I have never seen the CDC coming out,

saying, oh, you got to get your second polio shot, you got to get your third, you got to get your fourth, and this may continue to keep going.

I think the question we all should ask is: When does it stop and when are enough vaccines enough? We don't have that question because now Congress is discussing and debating a future COVID bill, an emergency bill. This is a future COVID bill to fund future variants and future vaccines. And not only future vaccines for the United States, but future vaccines for the entire world because somehow the United States is responsible for vaccinating the world against future COVID variants that we haven't even seen yet.

And somehow Congress thinks that we should do emergency funding, possibly up to $22 billion to study and prepare for future COVID variants and future COVID vaccines, and as many things as we need to do, but yet we aren't seeing them. How is that necessary to have emergency funding at $22 billion to fund something that we don't know is going to happen and shouldn't happen and would never have happened without the U.S.-funded gain of function research to the Wuhan lab? I think these are questions worth asking.

Now, another thing I would like to point out is President Trump had asked Congress for $22 billion to build a wall down at the southern border. Imagine if Congress had found it important or recognized the important need to go ahead and fund $22 billion back in 2017 or 2018, that wall would have been built.

I can tell you right now, I don't think we would be seeing and hearing about the numbers of illegal immigrants coming across our border and deadly fentanyl coming across like this. Imagine if Congress had taken seriously border security under President Trump and funded that $22 billion then that now Congress is considering funding for future COVID that we don't even have yet. These are good questions to ask.

These are the kind of questions that the regular American people ask, not the ones that live here in the Washington D.C. bubble; they are very disconnected here with real America.

Now, this is the thing that I just find so amazing. As we consider funding future COVID and future COVID vaccines, we have people at home that are sick and tired of their children being masked in school. They do not want to be forced to take a vaccine that they feel they should have the ability to decide about their own health, if they want to take it or not.

We are still trying to get back on track with not having to wear masks on airplanes, not having to send our kids to school to be masked, and not have to be shut down anymore. We have not recovered yet from the COVID crisis of the past 2 years. But, no, we have to consider more future COVID variants and future vaccines, and vaccinating the world against future COVID everything.

It never seems to stop, it is crisis after crisis. Unfortunately, a U.S.-funded gain of function research in a U.S.-funded lab in China gave birth to COVID–19 that has hurt the entire world.

Here is what we need to discuss. We need to ask the question: What is happening in these U.S.-funded labs? And we need to be willing to talk about it. We also need to ask the questions about the VAERS statistics. What if there are vaccine injuries? What if there are vaccine deaths?

It is okay to ask these questions because these may have affected people's lives, and that is important to do, right? But when we are talking about biolabs, we do know for a fact that the U.S. has funded the contracts not only to take over the labs, reconstruct them, but also build them. This goes through grants through private companies at millions and millions of dollars.

Now, what if these biolabs are handling very dangerous pathogens that may lead to the deaths in people in the areas. There are reports of possibly deadly pathogens escaping these biolabs in places like Ukraine, Georgia, Kazakhstan, that is responsible for killing people. What if that is true? I think these are questions that we should ask because no American citizen wants to be held morally and ethically responsible, and the U.S. Government should not be funding something that is killing people in a country that is not even our own, let alone here at home.

These are worthy questions. For that reason, because it has become such an issue and because it upsets so many people that I talk to constantly, I have introduced a bill to stop taxpayer funding for bioweapons and eliminate these programs from the Federal Government because no government should be creating bioweapons. That is evil and wrong.

Now, the name of this bill is the Stopping the Spread of Taxpayer-Funded Bioweapons Act. What if strange outbreaks surrounding U.S.-funded biolabs are the result of these labs and the work that is taking place in them? What if these labs are creating viruses just like COVID–19?

This is something that all of us should be against. That is why it would be so important to pass this bill and make sure that our United States Government is never funding anything deadly and never funding something like COVID–19. These are consequences that we cannot take and we should not handle and we should not ever consider.

Now, as we go further, we have a lot of issues to consider. We have an economy that is definitely in trouble. We have hyperinflation and gas prices out of control. We are looking at what is going to happen in Ukraine with Russia and what is going to happen in the world with all these sanctions. There are some issues to consider.

Now, the value of our dollar is extremely important. The value of our dollar affects our entire economy. If the value of our dollar were to go down suddenly, that would affect all Americans. Right now we are in a critical time where Saudi Arabia is discussing with China—talking to them about possibly switching from the petrodollar to trading with China's currency.

We have sanctioned Russia. And as Russia is looking at taking Ukraine and they are invading Ukraine and killing people in Ukraine, Russia has turned to China. Just recently Russia made a $117.5 billion deal with President Xi of China. That deal is to sell oil and gas to China.

Now with sanctions tightening on Putin and Russia, will we see Russia turn to China and switch to China's currency? What if Russia and Saudi Arabia switch from the dollar to China's currency? Then think further, what happens if countries like Venezuela or Cuba or any other country turns to China's currency?

If we go into a situation where we have two world competing currencies, the dollar is going to be hit very hard, and that is going to hurt America's economy, that is going to hurt every single one of us. If we think we are suffering under high inflation right now and high gas prices, well, we haven't seen anything yet. This is a dangerous situation and these are the things that I don't hear being talked about here in Congress very much.

These are not the things that our leaders are considering when they are beating the drums of war—wanting to go in and go to war with nuclear Russia. These are not the things that are being considered for our children and for our country's future, but these are the most important things they should be considering. Unfortunately, they are not.

□ 1845

Now, what we all should be doing is encouraging President Zelenskyy and President Putin to get to the negotiating table and stop people from being killed. That should be the most important thing we care about.

Sanctions are being put in place, and we should be considering what are going to be the real human costs when we are stopping countries from trading very important products like grain, fertilizer, and energy because it may be a punishment to those governments, but the real punishment is to the people in other countries and our own.

So my questions for our Congress—our United States Congress—are: Which country do we honestly serve? Which country do we honestly care about? And which people do we care about?

Because this body right here is funded by the American people and their hard-earned tax dollars, and the American people and their hard-earned tax dollars are the people we should consider first.

It is the United States of America we should consider first. It is the United

States currency, the dollar, we should consider first, and it is the United States economy we should consider first, our small businesses, our big businesses, and our border that should matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, tonight, I will finish with this: I think it is important for the United States Congress to talk more, to slow down in our decisions, to read our bills—every single one of us has the time to read them—and for every single one of us to vote in person—not by proxy—and not simply by saying ''yea'' or ''nay''.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISION TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA) and the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2022 (S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress)), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the Statement of Aggregates, Allocations, and Other Budgetary Levels for Fiscal Year 2022 as published in the Congressional Record on October 27, 2021.

In accordance with the CBA and S. Con. Res. 14, this revision makes an adjustment to previous amounts for program integrity for the Internal Revenue Service. Those amounts are contained in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022 (Public Law 117–103). These adjustments are allowable under section 4005(b) and section 4007 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th).

Accordingly, I am revising the aggregate spending level for fiscal year 2022 and the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2022. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocation are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on October 27, 2021.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Kellie Larkin of the Budget Committee staff.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman.

TABLE 1.—BUDGET AGGREGATE TOTALS

[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

	2022	2022–2031
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	4,168,314	n.a.
Outlays Total	4,505,637	n.a.
Revenues	3,401,380	38,957,374
Revision for the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022 (P.L. 117–103):		
Budget Authority	−417	n.a.
Outlays Total	−366	n.a.
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.
Revised Aggregates:		
BA	4,167,897	n.a.
OT	4,505,271	n.a.
Revenues	3,401,380	38,957,374

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations for fiscal years 2023 through 2031 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

[Unified amounts in millions of dollars]

	2022
Current Discretionary Allocation:	
BA	1,530,018
OT	1,685,953
Revision for Program Integrity (P.L. 117–103):	
BA	−417
OT	−366
Revised Discretionary Allocation:	
BA	1,529,601
OT	1,685,587
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	1,356,059
OT	1,355,730

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 3076. An act to provide stability to and enhance the services of the United States Postal Service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 18, 2022, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–3654. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the emergency third party transfer authorization from the Netherlands to Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–3655. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2021 21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–3656. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of a final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2022-05; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR-2022-0051, Sequence No.: 2] received March 9, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–3657. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy and Strategy, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Immigrant Juvenile Petitions [CIS No.: 2474-09; DHS Docket No.: USCIS-2009-0004] (RIN: 1615-AB81) received March 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3658. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Child Welfare Outcomes 2019: Report to Congress, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 679b(a)(5); Public Law 105-89, Sec. 203(a); (111 Stat. 2127); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–3659. A letter from the Chair, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting the Commission's March 2022 Report to Congress: Medicare Payment Policy, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 280g-15; Public Law 111-148, Sec. 399V-4(h)(3); (124 Stat. 1013); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NEAL (for himself, Mr. BRADY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KIND, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. REED, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MEIJER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KEATING, and Mrs. SPARTZ):

H.R. 7108. A bill to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Ways and Means, Rules, Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary; considered and passed.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 7109. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to require public lodging establishments to waive minimum age requirements for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 7110. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to clarify and expand authorization of support for chaplain-led programs for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 7111. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. KUSTOFF):

H.R. 7112. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to make grants for the establishment or expansion of internet exchange facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 7113. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit sums in the Thrift Savings Fund from being invested in any security of an entity based in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 7114. A bill to impose retaliatory tariffs on Chinese goods for financially supporting Russia through the increased purchases of Russian agricultural products during Russia's ongoing invasion of Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONG, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. PFLUGER, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MAST, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. DUNN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BRADY, Mr. CAWTHORN, and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 7115. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to expedite approval of exports of small volumes of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 7116. A bill to provide for improvements in the implementation of the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. LATURNER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MANN, Ms. MACE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ELLZEY, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 7117. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to prohibit a State from receiving or using funds or certain donations from private entities for the administration of an election for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 7118. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act relating to the sharing of death information with the Do Not Pay working system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself and Ms. MACE):

H.R. 7119. A bill to amend the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 to authorize the selection of eligible projects to be carried out using collaborative project delivery methods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 7120. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to promulgate regulations relating to the disclosure of certain commercial data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. BUDD, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 7121. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to maintain a list of the country of origin of all drugs marketed in the United States, to ban the use of Federal funds for the purchase of drugs manufactured in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Veterans' Affairs, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 7122. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out teacher leadership programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 7123. A bill to require the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study to identify barriers to reducing homelessness by providing housing assistance under the Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOODEN of Texas:

H.R. 7124. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the public reporting of certain contributions received by charitable organizations from foreign governments and foreign political parties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 7125. A bill to amend the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act to prevent the proliferation of biological weapons under the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 7126. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require Members of Congress to file the reports on transactions in stocks, bonds, commodities futures, and other forms of securities which are required under such Act not later than 7 days after the transactions are completed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. POSEY, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MAST, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 7127. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act to prohibit the Secretary from enforcing any drug or vaccine mandate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 7128. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize of the Secretary of the Treasury to place prohibitions or conditions on certain transmittals of funds in connection with jurisdictions, financial institutions, international transactions, or types of accounts of primary money laundering concern; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 7129. A bill to prohibit the importation of crude oil from Iran; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHELE:

H.R. 7130. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to convey the Makua Military Reservation to the State of Hawaii and establish a trust fund for such conveyance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. STEVENS):

H.R. 7131. A bill to promote economic growth and recovery throughout the Great Lakes region, to restore and to protect America's principal source of fresh water, which holds twenty percent of the world's freshwater, making it the largest system in the world, to foster innovation and to advance world-class workforce, education, training, and adjustment institutions for better jobs in the Great Lakes region, to strengthen and to expand the core U.S. manufacturing and industrial base, and the required energy systems to sustain and to power production, and to work with the federal Government and provinces of Canada on our mutual Great Lakes challenges including the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 7132. A bill to preserve safe access to communications services for survivors of domestic violence and other crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7133. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to require certain lobbyists to report certain contacts with agencies within 48 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7134. A bill to limit the use of Federal funds for the use of the travel expenses of senior Federal officials in contravention of certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7135. A bill to provide that the salaries of Members of a House of Congress will be held in escrow if that House has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022 by April 15, 2021, to eliminate automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress, to prohibit the use of funds provided for the official travel expenses of Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the legislative branch for first-class airline accommodations, and to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a uniform 5-year post-employment ban on lobbying by former Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Oversight and

Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7136. A bill to require the Speaker of the House of Representatives to convene a session of the House on each day in which a Government shutdown is in effect, to prohibit the use of funds for the official travel of Members of the House of Representatives during any period in which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7137. A bill to enact House Resolution 895, One Hundred Tenth Congress, (establishing the Office of Congressional Ethics) into permanent law; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBERNOLTE (for himself and Ms. JACOBS of California):

H.R. 7138. A bill to establish procedures to include certain foreign persons that pose a threat to the security of supply chains of Internet of Things devices on the Department of Commerce's Entity List, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 7139. A bill to codify Executive Order 13949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 7140. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the ability of Medicare and Medicaid providers to access the National Practitioner Data Bank for the purpose of conducting employee background checks; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STANSBURY (for herself, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 7141. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to States to empower public institutions of higher education in the States to provide student support services to students from low-income backgrounds, historically underrepresented students, first-generation college enrollees, parenting students, students with disabilities, and student veterans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. STEVENS (for herself, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 7142. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue a final rule adding as a class all perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances with at least one fully fluorinated carbon atom to the list of hazardous air pollutants under section 112(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(b)), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 7143. A bill to provide for energy rebates to individual taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 7144. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a feedback tool for use by members of the Armed Forces and their spouses to identify, rate, and compare housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 7145. A bill to encourage employer participation in apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 7146. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for penalty-free withdrawals from retirement accounts for certain emergency expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Mr. MEIJER, and Ms. JACOBS of California):

H.R. 7147. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to make publicly available on a website of the Department of Defense the cost to each United States taxpayer of certain contingency operations conducted by the United States Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. ELLZEY):

H.J. Res. 77. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H. Res. 989. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that United States policy should encourage Russian Government officials, including diplomats, to abandon Putin's war with Ukraine, and that Russian officials who defect should be granted expedited admission to the United States as refugees if they clear all applicable vetting and security procedures; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. CARL, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. DUNN, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. FALLON, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. HILL, Mr. STEIL, Mr. BACON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BARR, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BOST, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. ARRINGTON):

H. Res. 990. A resolution opposing engaging Russia for reviving any form of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) with Iran, opposing removing terrorism sanctions on Iran while Iran's support of terrorist activities remains unchanged, opposing restoring any form of the JCPOA while the issue of Iran's undeclared nuclear activities remains unresolved; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MAST, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. BALDERSON):

H. Res. 991. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President of the United States should take immediate steps to support the transfer of requested fighter aircraft to the Government of Ukraine for self-defense against invasion of their sovereign state; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 7108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 7109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 7110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 7111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 7112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 7113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 7114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 grants that Congress shall ''have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises;'' Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 grants that Congress shall ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among theseveral States, and with the Indian Tribes;''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 grants that ''The Congress shall have Power to . . . Make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by [the] Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mrs. CAMMACK:

H.R. 7115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 7116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 7117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 7118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 5, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 7119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1—All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 7120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I. Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Interstate Commerce Clause: Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 7122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: ''[The Congress shall have the power . . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 7123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GOODEN of Texas:

H.R. 7124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Thus, Congress has the authority not only to increase taxes, but also, to reduce taxes to promote the general welfare of the United States of America and her citizens. Additionally, Congress has the Constitutional authority to regulate commerce among the States and with Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 7125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 7126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 7127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 7128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 7129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Authority granted to Congress under Section 8, Article I of the Constitution, the power to regulate commerce.

By Mr. KAHELE:

H.R. 7130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 7131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (Taxing and Spending Clause)

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 (Commerce Clause)

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 7132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. OBERNOLTE:

H.R. 7138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 7139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article l, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United Sates Constitution

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 7140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. STANSBURY:

H.R. 7141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 7142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 7143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause ''to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or any Department or Office thereof.''

By Mrs. TRAHAN:

H.R. 7145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 7146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H.R. 7147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.J. Res. 77.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 214: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 515: Mr. BANKS, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. CLYDE.
H.R. 558: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
H.R. 621: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 783: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 882: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 1179: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1297: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1361: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 1481: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1540: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1568: Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 1644: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1665: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1842: Mr. GUEST, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WELCH, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. CURTIS, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1861: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1933: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 1946: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.
H.R. 1972: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 2038: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 2174: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 2192: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 2280: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 2294: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2313: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 2351: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 2489: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2525: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 2549: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2559: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 2565: Mr. SIRES and Mr. CROW.
H.R. 2718: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2724: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 2974: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 3072: Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 3095: Mr. ELLZEY.
H.R. 3115: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 3173: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3203: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 3258: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 3259: Mr. KUSTOFF.
H.R. 3281: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3304: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3342: Mr. GOLDEN and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 3372: Mr. KAHELE.
H.R. 3446: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3483: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3488: Ms. ROSS and Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 3506: Mr. DONALDS, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, and Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 3512: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3522: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3621: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 3770: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3940: Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 3946: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 4003: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4043: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 4319: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 4472: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 4558: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 4634: Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 4672: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4758: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 4794: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 4826: Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 4834: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 4951: Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. CARSON, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 5016: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 5056: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 5232: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COOPER, and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 5245: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 5338: Ms. MATSUI and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 5421: Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 5441: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 5528: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 5585: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 5607: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 5632: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. COMER.
H.R. 5759: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 5769: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5828: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 5874: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 5883: Mr. DELGADO and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 6006: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 6101: Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 6127: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina and Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 6145: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CLINE, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. BACON, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 6181: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 6184: Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 6201: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 6207: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 6212: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 6219: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 6225: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 6254: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 6272: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 6276: Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 6308: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 6337: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 6482: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 6494: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 6519: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 6571: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 6584: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 6592: Ms. MACE.
H.R. 6613: Mr. MRVAN and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 6625: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 6629: Ms. VAN DUYNE.
H.R. 6630: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PORTER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BASS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 6631: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PORTER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BASS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 6647: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 6667: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 6682: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6730: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
H.R. 6732: Mrs. HINSON and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 6777: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 6787: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 6823: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 6858: Ms. LETLOW, Mr. STEIL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 6865: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 6866: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 6872: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 6873: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 6891: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 6911: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 6919: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 6928: Ms. BUSH.
H.R. 6934: Mr. ALLRED and Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 6943: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 6970: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 6989: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 6990: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 7014: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BOST, Mr. HUDSON, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 7057: Mr. CLYDE.
H.R. 7058: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 7062: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 7066: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 7074: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 7075: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. BENTZ.
H.R. 7077: Ms. NEWMAN.
H.R. 7082: Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 7099: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MRVAN, Ms. NEWMAN, and Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 7100: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.J. Res. 3: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.J. Res. 46: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.J. Res. 72: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PALMER, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. MACE, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.J. Res. 76: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. STAUBER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CARL, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ESTES, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. BALDERSON.
H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H. Con. Res. 76: Mr. MANN.
H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 148: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H. Res. 237: Ms. ROSS.
H. Res. 290: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 582: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. GOODEN of Texas.
H. Res. 888: Mr. MEUSER.
H. Res. 891: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H. Res. 896: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H. Res. 987: Ms. SCANLON, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. WILD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. PORTER, Mr. TRONE, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. STEIL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MACE, Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. LIEU, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BACON, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MEIJER.
H. Res. 988: Mr. GROTHMAN.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2022 No. 48

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our shelter from the storms, protect the Ukrainian people as they trust You for safety.

Lord, all the good we will ever have comes from You. You have been faithful to Your people for millennia. Do not disappoint us now in this season of desperation. We see no other God but You, as this conflict continues to maim, kill, and destroy.

Lord, provide our lawmakers with the wisdom to cooperate with Your divine omnipotence in accomplishing Your purposes on Earth. May generations not yet born be told that You saved your people.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. ROSEN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, I see that you and many on the podium are decked in green. Happy St. Patrick's Day to all of you and to all of America.

NOMINATIONS

Madam President, now, yesterday, the Senate moved forward on a dozen judicial and administrative nominees, many of them with solid bipartisan support.

Today, we will hold three more floor votes: two to confirm a pair of district judges and one to move on the nomination of Judge Ali Nathan for the Second Circuit.

When I met Judge Nathan 10 years ago, I thought, ''Here is someone truly special and truly brilliant,'' and, a decade later, I still hold that view.

Ask her colleagues on the bench or ask her colleagues from private practice or even the likes of President Obama, and they will all say the same thing: Judge Nathan is a first-rate jurist and a consensus builder by nature.

I am pleased the Senate is acting on this well-deserving judge today, setting up a final confirmation vote next week.

NOMINATION OF JUDGE KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Madam President, speaking of nominations today, today is the last day the Senate will meet before we begin a truly historic series of hearings next Monday, starting at 11 a.m. The Senate Judiciary Committee will begin hearings for Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson's nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court.

These televised judiciary hearings will give millions of Americans a chance to hear from the judge directly for the first time since her nomination. These hearings matter. Americans deserve to hear for themselves from Judge Jackson, whose decisions will echo across American law for a long, long time.

Of course, the historic nature of this nominee must not be minimized. Of the 115 Justices who have sat on the Court, only 5—only 5—have been women; only 2—2—have been African Americans, Justices Thurgood Marshall and Clarence Thomas; only 1 has been Hispanic, Justice Sonia Sotomayor from the Bronx.

But, to date, never has an African-American woman come before the Judiciary Committee for consideration to the highest Court. Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson will be the very first.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

And the public will also see that her credentials, her vast experience in both public and private practice, and her near 9 years on the Federal bench make her stupendously qualified to bear the title ''Justice.''

I thank Chairman DURBIN and the members of the Judiciary Committee for their work orchestrating what has been a fair and quick nomination process, and all of us look forward to next week's hearings.

OIL

Madam President, now, on oil, I want to return to a worrying trend. Over the past few days, the price of crude has actually gone down, but the average price of a gallon is still stuck at nearly $4.30. If anyone thinks this is fair, efficient, or sensible, they are probably an oil executive. No matter what, the divergence between the price of crude and the price of a gallon is causing immense—immense—damage to American families at a time when they are all struggling to make ends meet.

Meanwhile, it is nothing short of repugnant for oil companies to be touting what are truly dizzying profit margins while soaking American families with these exorbitant prices. Last year, the top 25 oil and gas companies reported a combined $205 billion in profits. And what have they done with this avalanche of cash? Invest in new technologies? Nope. Give Americans a break at the pump? Nope.

They have been using their profits to reward shareholders by implementing stock buybacks. Listen to this. According to a recent Bloomberg report, in the fourth quarter of last year, oil and gas companies increased stock buybacks by over 2,000 percent from the previous year—2,000 percent—and none of it to produce more energy or invest in new technologies; just a massive windfall for shareholders. And their increase in stock buyback over the previous year is more than any other industry by quite a large margin.

The Senate, I am glad to say, is soon going to call executives from oil and gas companies to come testify and explain why they see fit to reward shareholders instead of finding ways to give Americans a break at the pump.

RUSSIA

Madam President, finally, on PNTR, on a final note, the House today is expected to vote on legislation revoking permanent normal trade relations with Russia.

For weeks, Members of the Senate, the House, and the White House have been working together to draft a strong and effective bill that will increase the pain on Putin's Russia and that our European allies will accept. To date, both parties, Democratic and Republican, remain united in sending Putin a clear message. His inhumane violence against the Ukrainian people will come at a crippling price.

And today's step by the House is another way we are making that come true. When the House passes this bill, I expect it will have broad bipartisan support here in the Senate, and I will work with my colleagues to find a way to move it through this Chamber quickly.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, next week, the Judiciary Committee will hear firsthand from President Biden's Supreme Court nominee Judge Jackson. It will be a serious and dignified process. The American people need answers to more important questions than what somebody wrote in the nominee's high school yearbook.

The Senate needs to examine Judge Jackson's qualifications, and we need to examine her judicial philosophy and see if she will apply laws as written and weigh cases without favoritism. And we need to explore why the farthest left activists in the country desperately wanted Judge Jackson, in particular, for this vacancy.

Judicial philosophy is a key qualification for the Supreme Court. There are plenty of smart lawyers in the country, but they don't all understand that a judge's proper role is to apply the text of the laws neutrally. Some would rather start with liberal outcomes and reason backward.

So it is unsettling that senior Democrats have lauded Judge Jackson for the ''empathy'' they suggest shapes her judicial approach. So if you are the litigant for whom the judge has special preexisting empathy, well, it is your lucky day; but the other party is being denied their fair day in court.

The Senate Democratic leader, the House majority whip, and multiple legal academics all say Judge Jackson will rule with ''empathy.'' Helpfully, one professor clarified which kinds of litigants would benefit from her empathy. He proposed that because of Judge Jackson's ''ample criminal defense experience,'' she would ''bring a measure of empathy to the criminal defense cases, the Fourth and Fifth Amendment cases.''

So liberals are saying that Judge Jackson's service as a criminal defense lawyer and then on the U.S. Sentencing Commission give her special empathy for convicted criminals. Her supporters look at her resume and deduce a special empathy for criminals. I guess that means that government prosecutors and innocent crime victims start each trial at a disadvantage.

That isn't my assertion. That is what the nominee's liberal supporters are all saying. In fact, the nominee has all but said it herself. Here is what the Washington Post reported last year when Judge Jackson was nominated to the DC Circuit:

> She and her allies credit her work as a public defender as helping her develop empathy.

And here they quote the nominee herself:

> There is a direct line from my defender service to what I do on the bench, and I think it's beneficial.

So, look, nobody is saying that public defenders ought to be disqualified from judicial service. It is an important role. But as the New York Times reported this week, the Biden administration is on an intentional quest to stuff the Federal judiciary full of this one perspective. Even amid a national crime wave, a disproportionate share of the new judges President Biden has nominated share this professional background that liberals say gives judges special empathy for criminal defendants.

Here is the New York Times:

> It is a sea change in the world of judicial nominations. . . . The type of high-profile murder cases handled by some of Mr. Biden's nominees would have been considered disqualifying only a few years ago; now the president . . . is actively seeking to name more jurists who have such experience.

It is not just Judge Jackson.

> At least 20 other lawyers with significant public defender experience have been nominated by the Biden administration.

One soft-on-crime advocate marveled to the reporter:

> We have never seen anything like this.

Such enthusiasm.

President Biden is deliberately working to make the whole Federal judiciary softer on crime. Even liberals admitted as much. They actually applaud it. But with murders and carjackings skyrocketing nationwide, I doubt the American people feel the same way.

I look forward to learning more about how Judge Jackson believes her service as a criminal defense attorney leads her to interpret the text of our laws and our Constitution differently than other judges. If any judicial nominee really does have special empathy for some parties over others, that is not an asset; it is a problem.

ENERGY

Madam President, on another matter, as Democratic policies have unleashed runaway inflation, families have felt particular pain at the gas pump.

Since President Biden took office, gas prices have climbed nearly $2—$2. The Biden administration wants to claim that a full year's worth of price hikes were all caused by a war Putin started 3 weeks ago. But this fictional version of events doesn't fool anyone.

Two years ago, then-candidate Biden told everyone he was ready to wage war on the most reliable forms of American energy:

> No ability for the oil industry to continue to drill, period. [It] ends.

That is President Biden.

I guarantee you . . . We're going to end fossil fuel.

In other words, either the Biden administration has a shaky understanding of supply and demand or soaring energy prices have been baked into their agenda right from the beginning.

For 14 months now, energy policy has followed a disturbing pattern. First, the Biden administration rolls out a direct attack on American energy, then working families feel the pinch, and then Democrats try to deflect the blame. Take the Keystone XL Pipeline. President Biden made canceling it a day one priority. Then, as gasoline, diesel, and other energy prices climbed, the White House justified itself by saying the project would have taken years to affect prices anyway.

The problem is, back during the Obama administration, their own analysis suggested the project would be fully operational by 2013. They spent a decade fighting against a pipeline that would have taken a couple of years to come online by complaining it was not immediate enough.

That was their argument a decade ago, and it is their argument now. The pipeline could have been built multiple times over in the time the Democrats spent resisting it. Besides, if slow construction were really the problem, the administration would be rushing to rein in their own regulatory army that is handcuffing other new and existing pipelines with mountains of extra bureaucracy.

Just weeks ago, while Putin was already amassing forces and trying to make energy hostages out of Western Europe, the Biden administration's Federal Energy Regulatory Commission went out of its way to make permitting new American natural gas pipelines radically more difficult.

Here is yet another example. Last year, the Biden administration directed the SEC to prioritize discouraging loans, capital, and financing for fossil fuel energy projects. But now that a worldwide scramble has sent prices sky-high, the administration blames the industry and says it is ''time for oil and gas companies to work with Wall Street to unleash our productive capacity.'' The administration that campaigned on ending fossil fuels now claims the fossil fuel companies are just layabouts who don't want to drill. It is enough to make your head spin.

Oh, and President Biden rushed to lash America back to the mast of a climate deal that actually gave China a pass to keep increasing their emissions. As Germany prepared to give Putin an even tighter hold on Europe's market for natural gas with the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, President Biden fought bipartisan efforts to stop the pipeline.

His response to soaring prices hurting families last year was to go hat in hand and beg OPEC and Russia to produce more. And now that Russia has invaded Ukraine, the Biden administration is reportedly exploring more imports—listen to this—from Venezuela and Iran, totalitarian regimes with contempt for human rights and the environment.

So it turns out the Biden administration doesn't mind fossil fuel production after all. They just don't want to ''Buy American.'' The administration will buy oil from the Supreme Leader of Iran; they will buy oil from Maduro. If North Korea had oil, they would probably try to buy that, too. Anything—anything—to avoid keeping those jobs and that energy independence right here in the USA.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

MONACAN INDIAN NATION

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise today to speak about a really important victory in Virginia yesterday—a victory for the Monacan Indian Nation, and it is a victory that I have had a hand in over the course of many years. I want to describe it and celebrate it.

When the English came to Virginia first in 1607, there were thriving Virginia Native populations. The populations east—in eastern Virginia, east of Richmond—were part of a larger confederacy called the Powhatan Confederacy, and they spoke an Algonquian-based language. There were Tribes in the southern part of Virginia that spoke an Iroquois-based language, and Tribes in the western part of Virginia spoke a Sioux-based language. One of these Tribes was the Monacan Tribe.

John Smith, in 1607, 1608, and 1609, traveled all around the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries and did some very detailed mapmaking of the area, including a town that he called the chief Monacan town named Rassawek. Rassawek is on a point of land in what is now Fluvanna County, VA, where the Rivanna River and the James River combine.

Rassawek was the headquarters, or the chief administrative town, of the Monacan Tribal Nation. The story of the Virginia Tribes is one of triumph, but also one of tragedy. Many of the Tribes made peace treaties with the English in the 1670s. All of these Tribes were discriminated against, and some were driven far from their homes.

The Monacan Tribe was driven by the English settlers from Rassawek, further west into Amherst County, and then many of them were driven even further west into the middle west end and other places. But Rassawek maintained its sacred status to the Monacan Nation for many reasons, including the fact that so many of Monacan families were buried there and their remains are still there.

An aspect of the tragedy of the Virginia Tribes is that: When I was elected to be a Senator in 2012, none of the Virginia Tribes had ever been recognized, even though many still live intact in communities in Virginia. There were over 500 Tribes that had been federally recognized. The Virginia Tribes are part of exhibits at the Smithsonian Museum at the foot of Capitol Hill; and yet they had never been recognized. And they had never been recognized for three reasons.

One, they made peace treaties with the English rather than with the United States. Often, recognition begins with the treaty entered into with the United States. Second, often, recognition is determined by extensive submission of land records and other records. Many Virginia courthouses were burned during the Civil War, and so records establishing Tribal lands, for example, were destroyed.

But, finally, and most cruelly, Virginia had an official named Walter Plecker who served as the State's director of the Department of Vital Statistics from 1920 until the 1960s. And he was a eugenicist. He believed there was no such thing as Indians, that they were all color. And, systemically, he determined to take every record he could find of Tribal communities in Virginia and change the racial designation of those records—birth certificates, marriage licenses, death notices—of Indian members to ''color,'' even to the point of disinterring Indians who had been buried in cemeteries that were primarily cemeteries for Caucasians. This made it, again, very difficult for these Tribes. They refer to this as the ''paper genocide'' for them to assert their claim for Tribal recognition.

I started working with the Monacan and six other Tribes when I was mayor of Richmond on this issue because I became friends with a guy named Steve Adkins, who is the chief of one of these Tribes, the Chickahominy Tribe.

We worked over the course of many, many years—these Tribes coming to Congress and asking for Federal recognition. And when I came into office in January of 2013, this was very, very high on my to-do list, to finally right this historic wrong and correct an injustice and allow these Virginia Tribes—whose stories are so well known and still live in these communities—to finally be recognized.

Now, we have gotten seven Tribes recognized—one through the Bureau of Indian Affairs process, the Pamunkey Tribe, and six through an act of Congress. I thank the Presiding Officer because all of my colleagues joined together at the end of 2018 and, in a unanimous vote, finally did justice by the Virginia Tribes, including the Monacan Tribe.

Now onto Rassawek. The Monacans were driven further west and now have their, sort of, Tribal headquarters in a place called Bear Mountain in Amherst County. The chief of the Tribe is a man named Ken Branham. Ken is a good friend.

In 2014, a local authority, the James River Water Authority in Fluvanna County, decided that strategic location at the merger of two rivers would be a perfect place to build big water treatment intake and treatment facility. It

is a growing community. There are more water needs in the community. The facility was needed, but the site they chose for the construction of the facility was Rassawek.

The authority proceeded forward to purchase the land and then undertake engineering studies to build this water treatment facility. At the time, 2014, the Monacans had not yet been federally recognized. They could complain, and they could argue, but they didn't have the clout that Federal recognition would eventually give them. Yet many people rallied to the Monacans' cause and said, ''Look, we preserve other sites all the time.''

Virginia is first in the Nation in preserving, for example, Civil War battlefield sites, and we preserved the ancestral home of the Powhatan of Werowocomoco on the York River, which is soon to be a national park. Should we allow Rassawek to be essentially destroyed and the remains of Monacans buried there for generations to be disturbed?

Armed with Federal recognition, the Monacans attracted even more support. The National Trust for Historic Preservation, in 2020, named Rassawek as one of the most 11 endangered sites in the country. A huge grassroots effort developed because of the hard work of the Tribe that assembled thousands and thousands of supporting individuals—some very nearby Rassawek, but some very far away—to advocate that there has to be a better solution for this water treatment need in Fluvanna County than to disturb and destroy Rassawek.

Yesterday, the James River Water Authority, in a unanimous vote, decided to set aside their plan to do the water intake facility in Rassawek and to donate the land that they have purchased for that facility to the Monacan Tribe. The Monacan Nation, in gratitude, pledges to work together with the James River Water Authority to find a more acceptable site. A number of alternatives have already been identified.

This summer, I was canoeing on the James River. I canoed the entire James River from where it starts, the Allegheny Mountains, to Fort Monroe in Chesapeake Bay—350 miles. It took me 26 days that I spread over the spring, summer, and fall. One day in August, I was canoeing from a town called New Kent to Columbia, passing Rassawek, which was on river left as I went downstream.

So I reached out to Chief Branham, knowing that the fight about the future of Rassawek was underway. I said: Could you and Tribal leaders meet me? I will pull my canoe onshore when I pass by. Meet me and talk to me about the status of this fight and why it is so important to the Monacan Nation to win.

So coming down the river with a friend, my former State director who used to work on this Tribal recognition issue, John Knapp—I want to thank him, as well as other staffers, Evan and Nick and Tyee and Mary and other staffers in my office, who worked on this. John and I pulled our canoe over on the shore in this beautiful spot in rural Virginia where the two rivers come together. We beached the canoe on a sand point, climbed a bluff, and met Chief Branham and other members of Monacan leadership to see the beauty of the site and to share a meal but also to talk to them about the importance of Rassawek and why they really, really needed to win this battle. They don't have a plan to develop Rassawek. They are not going to build anything there. They just want it to be preserved in its natural beauty out of respect for Monacan people who have lived there for nearly 5,000 years. Yesterday, this unanimous vote by the local water authority—a vote of respect, a vote of acknowledgment—recognized that this is a sacred site.

We in Virginia, we love our history. We love our history, and we don't want to lose it. The history of the Monacan Nation, the history of all of our Tribes is worthy of battling. You don't win every battle. The Monacan Nation won a really important one yesterday, and it might not have happened. Ninety-nine of my colleagues joined with me to make sure that the Monacan Nation and the other Virginia Tribes were finally, after hundreds of years, given Federal recognition.

I just wanted to express my congratulations to the Monacan Nation and my appreciation to my colleagues for helping me do something good.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF GIGI SOHN

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, the Senate Commerce Committee recently voted on the nomination of Gigi Sohn to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission. I voted against her nomination for a number of serious reasons, as did the 13 other Republican committee members.

I was deeply disappointed that not one of my Democratic colleagues on the committee stepped forward to affirm what should be glaringly obvious: that Ms. Sohn is not an appropriate candidate for a position on the Federal Communications Commission.

One substantial concern I have with Ms. Sohn's nomination is her extreme position on net neutrality.

Back in 2014, the Obama administration decided that the Federal Government wasn't regulating the internet enough. So in 2015, the Obama Federal Communications Commission passed what was known as the Open Internet Order—mislabeled, I would add, but which dramatically expanded the Federal Government's power over the internet. The justification for this massive regulatory expansion was net neutrality.

Now, net neutrality is a concept that enjoys broad support in both parties. I support net neutrality and rules that prevent blocking, throttling, and the paid prioritization of internet traffic. I don't think a major service provider should be able to block a small news startup. But what the Obama FCC did in 2015 went far beyond net neutrality. The Obama FCC asserted broad, new government powers over the internet using rules that were designed for telephone monopolies back during the Great Depression. This opened the door to a whole host of internet regulations, including price regulations, and unsurprisingly, broadband investment declined as a result.

That was a problem for Americans generally, who benefit when the United States is at the forefront of internet growth and expansion, and it was particularly bad news for Americans in rural States like South Dakota. Getting broadband to rural communities is already more challenging than installing broadband in cities or suburbs, and the possibility of heavier regulations acted as a further disincentive to expanding access.

Fast-forward to 2017, and the Federal Communications Commission under Chairman Pai voted to repeal those heavyhanded regulations passed by the Obama FCC, and here is what happened: Broadband investment rebounded, and broadband access expanded. Internet speeds increased. Our Nation positioned itself at the forefront of the 5G revolution. While European internet providers were slowing internet speeds during the pandemic, American providers were increasing them. All this despite the repeal of the heavyhanded internet regulation Democrats claimed we needed—or more accurately, because of the repeal of the heavyhanded regulation Democrats claimed we needed.

Why do I go into all this history? Well, because Ms. Sohn not only wants to bring back the heavyhanded internet regulation of the Obama administration, but she wants to go further and have the FCC regulate broadband rates and set data caps.

Just as service providers are working to implement nationwide 5G networks, Ms. Sohn wants to reinstate rules that will discourage broadband investment and diminish access opportunities for Americans outside of major cities and suburban areas. That is a big problem. The light-touch approach to internet regulation that the Federal Government has historically taken has resulted in growth and access, both of which would be threatened by Ms. Sohn's agenda.

Now, while I was very pleased that the FCC under Chairman Pai repealed

President Obama's heavyhanded internet regulation, I believe the best solution for the long term is for Congress to step in and pass bipartisan net neutrality legislation. Swings in net neutrality policy from administration to administration do not encourage long-term broadband investment.

I believe there is bipartisan support for a long-term legislative solution but not, it would seem, from Ms. Sohn, who has openly disparaged bipartisan work on this issue. Now, I think Ms. Sohn would be fine if Congress produces a bill to her liking, but I have serious concerns that if she thought a bipartisan solution didn't go far enough, she would ignore the will of Congress and use her position at the FCC to impose the heavyhanded regulatory regime she favors.

As a resident of a rural State, I am also concerned about Ms. Sohn's position on expanding broadband access to rural communities—an issue every Member of this body cares deeply about. She has been publicly hostile to the efforts of rural broadband companies in expanding reliable internet access to rural areas, while at the same time supporting the use of scarce government dollars to build new internet networks in already well-served urban areas.

As someone who has worked long and hard to expand internet access for unserved Americans, I find her hostility to rural broadband companies very troubling. The vast majority of these companies have spent years building out reliable networks to some of the most remote parts of the country, allowing more rural areas, like those in South Dakota, to reap the benefits of advanced services in healthcare, education, and economic development.

It is not only Republicans who have taken note of her hostility to the needs of rural Americans. Our former Democratic colleague from North Dakota has also questioned how one could support rural broadband and Ms. Sohn.

Ms. Sohn's policy positions alone would lead me to oppose her nomination, but there are other even more troubling factors that should be leading Members of both parties to oppose her nomination.

To start with, Ms. Sohn was not forthcoming to the Commerce Committee about her past history on the board of a company that was ordered to cease operations after being found in violation of copyright laws. This raises serious concerns about her fitness to sit on the FCC.

After questions were raised about her involvement with this company's settlement with broadcasters, she did volunteer to recuse herself, if she is confirmed, on a variety of issues related to broadcasting and copyright violations. But why on Earth—why on Earth should we choose a Commissioner who would have to recuse herself from participating in substantial parts of the FCC's work? How does it serve Americans to have an FCC Commissioner who can't fully do her job? Surely, there are other qualified nominees who don't have Ms. Sohn's conflict of interest.

But my objections don't end there. While I am concerned about Ms. Sohn having to recuse herself from doing parts of her job, I am most concerned about whether or not Ms. Sohn can do any part of her job in a fair and impartial manner.

Ms. Sohn has a history of virulent partisanship and far-left activism, including support for such far-left initiatives as defunding the police. She has publicly expressed her disdain for Republicans, and she has a record of outspoken criticism of the very same conservative media outlets that she would be responsible for regulating. Perhaps the most notable example is her hostility towards FOX News, which she has referred to as ''state-sponsored propaganda'' and accused of playing a role in ''destroying democracy.''

''Destroying democracy.''

And yet we are supposed to believe that she would approach cases involving the FOX corporation impartially? I think it is pretty clear that would not be the case.

I don't expect a Democrat nominee to the FCC to agree with Republicans on all the issues—far from it. But I do expect a Democrat nominee to do his or her job and do it in an impartial and unbiased manner.

In the case of Ms. Sohn, President Biden has nominated someone who cannot fulfill part of the responsibilities of FCC Commissioner and whose record strongly suggests that she cannot be relied upon to fulfill any of her responsibilities in an impartial manner.

Americans deserve an FCC nominee who can do her job impartially, no matter what the matter before the Commission. And I hope that if Ms. Sohn's nomination comes to the floor, at least some of my Democrat colleagues will join Republicans in opposing her nomination.

We should all be able to agree that virulent partisanship and an inability to fulfill the responsibilities of one's job are disqualifying characteristics for a role on the FCC.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). The Senator from Alabama.

PROTECTION OF WOMEN AND GIRLS IN SPORTS ACT OF 2021

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, today I want to talk about the real March madness that we are having this month, moments about basketball and the tournament, but I want to talk about the madness of attacking title IX, attacking women's sports, and attacking women in general.

Last night marked the beginning of the 2022 NCAA Women's Swimming and Diving Championship. Instead of celebrating the many hard-working women who earned their spot in the championship, I expect much of the media attention to be around a singular competitor—a transgender athlete who competed as a male as recently as 2019.

But the discussion should not be about inclusivity; it should be about fairness. I have spoken about this issue before and, last March, actually forced a vote on the amendment that would have prevented Federal funds from going to educational institutions that allowed biological males to compete in women's athletics.

Unfortunately, colleagues on the left were more interested in pandering to the far left than they were in protecting the ability for girls and women to participate in fair—and I repeat, fair—competition. They refused to support my amendment.

And I would argue that by allowing biological males to complete in women's athletics, Democrats have set serious efforts for women's equality back by decades. And, ultimately, this will have the effect of discouraging many, many, many young women from participating in sports.

In a recent article, two parents of a current collegiate athlete said:

> I think the NCAA needs to change its policies, and find a way to include transgender women without trampling all over biological women.

I agree.

Well, the NCAA has been silent. They have failed to take decisive action in ensuring a level playing field for all of women.

And so now Congress must act to do so. This is why I joined Senator MIKE LEE and 16 fellow colleagues in introducing the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2021. This is critical legislation that would make it a violation—a violation—of title IX for a recipient of related Federal funds to permit a biological male from participating in an athletic program or activity designated for women and girls.

The bill would also establish the definition of ''sex'' in title IX as based ''solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth.''

It is imperative for Congress to act so that an entire generation of women aren't discouraged from pursuing their athletic dreams, whether on the field, whether on the court, or whether in the swimming pool.

As some of the most talented female swimmers in the country prepare to compete over the next few days, it would be wrong not to call out the inherent unfairness in allowing a biological male to participate in several women's events.

Penn's transgender athlete will compete in the women's 100-, 200-, and 500-yard freestyle events. Just a few short years ago, this athlete was competing in men's collegiate swimming events.

Since being allowed to switch, this swimmer has shattered—and I mean completely shattered—records in women's events.

In December, at the Zippy Invitational, this athlete set new national and school records in the 1,650-, the

500-, and the 200-yard freestyle events and continues to dominate the competition.

At the invitational, this swimmer won the 1,650-yard freestyle with a new record time of 15:59.71. The second-place swimmer finished 38 seconds later.

At the Ivy League Championships last month, this swimmer broke the 200-yard freestyle record of 1 minute and 43 seconds, beating out the last record by over a half a second, and the pool record was beat by 2 seconds.

Having been a coach for 40 years, I can attest more so than anyone in Congress that there are fundamental differences between men and women when it comes to sports. But you don't have to take my word for it. A recent study concludes that ''on average, males have (1) 40–50 percent greater upper limb strength, (2) 20–40 percent greater lower limb strength, and (3) an average of 12 pounds more skeletal muscle mass than age-matched females at any given body weight.''

Lungs are bigger; heart is bigger. Competing in swimming, in the women's swimming division, has given this Penn athlete an unfair advantage that no one else in the field can overcome.

Some have been too afraid to speak up, fearing they will be sacrificed at the altar of political correctness, or that they will be canceled if they say it is unfair for a biological male to compete against a biological female, or that they will be shunned if they don't embrace inclusivity over fairness.

But some have already bravely voiced their opinion.

The advocacy organizations Champion Women and Women's Sports Policy Working Group released dual petitions on Tuesday with over 5,000 signatures, asking for policymakers to prioritize ''fairness and safety for females'' instead of ''blanket transgender inclusion or exclusion'' in women's sports.

The petitions were organized by three-time Olympic gold medalist, and the founder of Champion Women, Nancy Hogshead. According to Champion Women, the petitions were signed by nearly 300 Olympians, Paralympians, and U.S. national team members, as well as over 2,500 athletes who have competed at the high school, club, or collegiate levels.

This is why Congress must act to pass the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2021.

Allowing biological males to compete in women's athletics threatens—threatens—to undo all progress that has been made under title IX.

Title IX has provided women and girls the long-denied platform that had always been afforded just to men and boys. It ensures female athletes had the same access to funding, facilities, and athletic scholarships. Before title IX, female athletes received less than 2 percent of the college athletic budget—only 2 percent—and athletic scholarships for women were virtually nonexistent.

And since the 1970s, when I first started coaching, female participation at the college level has risen by more than 600 percent.

So this week, the NCAA championship will once again emphasize that the debate is not limited just to the Halls of Congress, but one that we are seeing play out across the country.

It is an undeniable fact that biological males have a physiological advantage over females—a fact. So let me be clear: The question here is not should we be inclusive and supportive of all athletes; it is how.

The first step the Senate can take to address the wrong that the NCAA has allowed to happen is to pass S. 251.

There is an attack on women's sports. In the long run, there is an attack on women in this country. It has to stop, and it has to stop now.

So I ask my colleagues to stand up for America's female athletes and women all throughout this country and support these efforts to preserve women's sports.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 643, Laura S. H. Holgate, to be Representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, with the rank of Ambassador; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, reserving the right to object, the Biden administration has failed to properly oversee the Pan American Health Organization, or PAHO.

President Biden and Secretary Blinken know that PAHO has cooperated with the communist regime in Cuba to traffic doctors overseas, and they know there are Cuban doctors who are trying to sue PAHO and hold traffickers accountable.

Here are the facts. In July 2013, the Cuban Ministry of Health signed an agreement with the Brazilian Ministry of Health to formalize an arrangement for Cuban doctors to provide medical services in Brazil.

That agreement required the administration of former Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff to transmit a monthly payment through PAHO to the Cuban Ministry of Health for the medical services provided by each Cuban doctor serving in Brazil.

It also prevented Cuban doctors from seeking employment in Brazil outside of the formal structure of the arrangement.

More than 20,000 Cuban medical professionals serving in Brazil under the Mais Medicos Program had their wages stolen by the Cuban Government and received only a small fraction of what they earned, and that was with the support of PAHO.

Their family members were prohibited from accompanying them, and many had their passports confiscated.

Cuban doctors were the only medical professionals participating in the program who had their salaries directly garnished by their government. Meanwhile, doctors from other countries, serving in Brazil, received their full wages for their medical services.

Other Cuban doctors have suffered similar abuses in Angola, Guatemala, Mexico, Qatar, and Venezuela.

For example, in 2019, a group of Cuban doctors reported they had been directed and often coerced to use their medical services to influence votes in favor of the Maduro regime, including by denying medical treatment to opposition supporters and by giving precise voting instructions to elderly patients.

This gross program is a huge moneymaker for the communist thugs ruling Cuba.

In 2018 alone, they pocketed more than $6.3 billion from exporting Cuban professionals to work overseas. This is clearly human trafficking, and medical missions by Cuban doctors represent a majority of those profits.

Since I have been in the Senate, since 2019, I have been fighting for these Cuban doctors and against human trafficking. But actually nothing has been done to hold PAHO accountable. PAHO is hiding behind legal immunity. President Biden has the power to lift their immunity, and I have requested his administration do so multiple times, but they have shamefully declined. It is wrong.

Victims of human trafficking deserve to see their alleged abusers in court, and PAHO should never be able to hide behind claims of immunity to avoid accountability for their role in facilitating those abuses.

I have informed Secretary Blinken that until substantial steps toward fulfilling this request are made, I will be blocking all relevant State Department nominees.

Americans deserve qualified and competent people in positions of power who put American interests first. If this administration wants to appease dictators like the Castro and Diaz-Canel regimes and go to Venezuela and try to buy oil, I am going to hold them accountable.

Therefore, Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I appreciate the concerns that my friend from Florida has raised. However, I am just struggling to see how the safety

and security of Ukraine's 15 nuclear reactors, in the midst of the largest reoccurrence of warfare on the European Continent since World War II, has any relationship to the issue which he raised.

Russia is blocking International Atomic Energy Agency access into Ukraine. The proper response by the Senate—by the Senator from Florida—is not to block our Ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency at a time when Putin, at a time when Lavrov, are talking about nuclear weapons.

We need a representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency. That is what the Senator from Florida is blocking right now on the floor—just did it.

All across our country Americans are right now wondering, is a nuclear war once again possible? What if the Russians launch a tactical nuclear weapon into Ukraine against a nonarticle 5 country; what is our response?

They are wondering, does the IAEA have access to the 15 Ukrainian nuclear powerplants that the Russians, with military force, are taking over?

What are the protections that are going to be put in place in order to ensure that we, in fact, have done everything that we can do to avoid a nuclear accident, either a nuclear weapon or a nuclear powerplant accident?

That is where we are right now, and what I hear from the Senator from Florida is a disposition on a subject completely unrelated to those issues, as Americans are all tuned in on a daily basis in a way that they have not since 1962 to the very real potential that there could be a nuclear exchange—nuclear weapons exchange—between Russia and the West.

So, from my perspective, this is a historic moment that we have to come together in a bipartisan way to provide a response—a response to Russia, a response to their allies—that we are deadly serious. Instead, what the Senator from Florida has done is to arrive to object to the confirmation of Laura Holgate so that she can be there.

She is fully qualified. She is an allstar in her knowledge of all of these issues, but she won't be on duty. She won't be there with our allies, with the technical experts on all nuclear issues, because of this objection which we just heard.

From my perspective, we are at a pretty big turning point here. We need to be talking to everyone. We are either going to know each other or we are going to exterminate each other. That is the point in time at which we are at. We are either going to talk to each other or we could potentially slip into an accidental nuclear catastrophe that historians and future generations of young people will look back and say: How did that happen?

Well, one of the reasons why it can happen is we can't even get an American to be confirmed by the Senate at this time of great crisis because of an objection from the Republican Party. I mean, partisanship should stop at the water's edge, but when you are talking about nuclear weapons, there shouldn't even be a discussion about it. We should just let this highly qualified woman get on the job to use her expertise in defense of our country and in defense of everyone on the planet because this could quickly—quickly—trigger accidents that escalate, and then the unimaginable could happen.

So that is where we are right now. We need an ambassador to draw attention to the danger of Russian forces, especially holding Ukraine's nuclear operations at gunpoint. We need an ambassador to demand that Russia accept the IAEA's offer to establish a presence in Ukraine to ensure the continued safe operation of Ukraine's nuclear facilities.

Russia knows from the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear accident, the worst in history, that deadly radioactive fallout does not respect borders.

And we need an ambassador at the IAEA to perform a wide array of duties outside of the Ukraine crisis, from keeping nonnuclear weapon countries nonnuclear and making sure that this doesn't trigger attempts by other countries to gain access to nuclear materials and then nuclear weapons. And we have to make sure, ultimately, that we confirm Laura Holgate.

First, she served the same role in the Obama administration. She hits the ground running. She knows these issues. Second, she is a protege of Senator Sam Nunn and Senator Richard Lugar, and like that legendary bipartisan duo, she has devoted her career to dismantling weapons of mass destruction and materials that could be used by terrorists as dirty bombs.

So how is it that we still don't have an ambassador seated at the International Atomic Energy Agency's meetings on Ukraine, given this body unanimously confirmed Ambassador Holgate in December to be our representative to the other U.N. organizations based in Vienna?

That is a good question and it has no good answer and we did not hear that answer on floor of the U.S. Senate just 5 minutes ago, when the Senator from Florida objected. We didn't hear a word about their objections.

I will tell you what, they are creating very risky conditions for all Americans when they deny our country a seat at the table at the International Atomic Energy Agency at this time in history.

I was the same age as the pages on the floor today when the Cuban missile crisis cast a shadow over our Nation. I remember what that was like.

We are slipping day by day into a situation where we could be confronted with similar conditions, and the least that we should be able to say is we tried, we really tried, to avoid that nuclear catastrophe. And the minimum that we should do is have an ambassador who is at the table who is talking to all of our allies and the rest of the world about these issues right now.

Ukraine and the whole of Europe averted disaster when a Russian munition fell just short of Ukraine's nuclear reactors just a couple of weeks ago. We may not be so lucky the next time if Russian forces move on the country's other facilities with the same reckless abandon.

What possible benefit is derived from keeping our ambassadorial post at the IAEA unfilled at a time like this? We make nuclear safety and nuclear security a partisan issue at our own peril and at the peril of every family in our country as well as Europe.

It is just absolutely irresponsible, for unrelated reasons, to deny our country that kind of protection right now.

So we are going to keep coming back with this, and the reason we are is that we can see a continued escalation. We can see, in Putin's own words, reckless intent. And it is not for us to judge whether he is sincere or not in terms of his consideration of the use of nuclear weapons or his lack of full consideration of what the consequences are of having armed attacks on nuclear powerplant facilities all over Ukraine.

We can't get inside of his brain, but the least we can do is have someone go to the table from America, someone who has dedicated her life—Ambassador Holgate—to this work.

That is what happened here on the floor right now. It was a partisan politicization of nuclear proliferation, of nuclear safety, at a time where we are seeing a peril that we have not seen in 50 years in the United States or the planet.

All I can tell you is history will not come back and well receive the partisan objection for the completely unrelated reasons for not allowing us to have that kind of representation at the nuclear table at this particular point in time.

I intend to return on this subject, as many times as it takes, so that we can have someone who is there protecting every family in our country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the next vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UKRAINE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, since Vladimir Putin's invasion of Ukraine, we have all been inspired by the courage and leadership of Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy.

As Russian troops invaded and brutally attacked his country, President

Zelenskyy did not do as others have done in the past. He didn't run; he didn't hide; and he didn't give in. President Zelenskyy did what every leader hopes to have the courage to do in times of crisis: He stood his ground, spoke out, and rallied the rest of the world to get behind him.

Yesterday, as we all know, Members of Congress had a chance to hear directly from President Zelenskyy.

First, he expressed his gratitude to the United States for the support we have provided so far to his country, but he also issued an urgent plea for more defense articles. He showed us a videotape of devastating photos and videos coming out of Ukraine, demonstrating what the Ukrainian people are being subjected to every day by Putin's cruel and unprovoked war against innocent civilians.

Ukrainian troops need more arms. They need anti-tank capabilities, and they need additional aircraft. As President Zelenskyy put it, the destiny of Ukraine is being decided now, as we speak.

I believe we have a moral obligation—not necessarily a treaty obligation since Ukraine isn't part of NATO, but we have a moral obligation as the leader of the free world—and I am talking about the United States as a whole—to support Ukraine and help them defend their sovereignty and their people.

For example, Poland, a member of NATO, offered to transfer an entire fleet of MiG–29 fighters to the United States for delivery to Ukraine. Ukrainian forces already know how to fly those Russian aircraft, and President Zelenskyy assured us that they are desperately needed, but the Biden administration rejected the offer out of fear that it might provoke Mr. Putin or, in terms of war, might escalate the conflict.

Winston Churchill, another great wartime leader, aptly said:

> An appeaser is one who feeds a crocodile, hoping it will eat him last.

This cannot be the policy of the United States. We cannot appease Vladimir Putin, and we can't afford to be timid in the face of the greatest threat to world peace since World War II.

Here on the Senate floor, several weeks ago, I shared a maxim of another Russian leader, Vladimir Lenin, the leader of the Soviet Union, of course, at the time. This is something I would suspect that Mr. Putin agrees with.

Lenin said:

> You probe with bayonets. If you find mush, you push. If you find steel, you withdraw.

In short, if people like Vladimir Lenin and Vladimir Putin are met with weakness, they are going to keep coming; if they are met with strength, they may withdraw.

President Putin clearly subscribes to this world view. He doesn't respect weakness. In fact, weakness is a provocation; it encourages him. A weak opponent is Putin's greatest desire. President Biden, unfortunately, in not acting more forcefully and taking the initiative as only leaders can do, is playing into his hand.

The Biden administration has time and time again eventually come around to doing the right thing when it comes to arming the Ukrainians. Unfortunately, it has only been after there has been a public outcry or more pressure from Congress or President Zelenskyy.

Last year, President Biden waived sanctions on the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline. This, of course, is a natural gas pipeline that goes from Russia to Germany. One of the things, even now, the Germans have recognized is their vulnerability to the monopoly that Russia has when it comes to providing oil and gas to Europe.

As Russia built up troops on Ukraine's border, President Biden suggested that some attacks on Ukrainian sovereignty would be ''minor intrusions'' and perhaps disregarded by the United States, he implied.

President Biden ignored the advice of virtually all of his advisers and missed the window to impose paralyzing sanctions on Russia before the invasion, and now the administration continues to refuse to facilitate the transfer of these Polish fighter jets.

In standard fashion, the administration seems to be a little confused by this crisis—afraid to say yes and too afraid to say no.

I am reminded of President Obama's statement of ''leading from behind,'' which appears to be an approach embraced now by President Biden.

Strong words are important, but they don't defend against rockets or cruise missiles. Sanctions are important, but they won't take out a Russian tank. Humanitarian aid is important, but only if it is delivered on a timely basis and when it is needed. And waiting and seeing what will develop next and then responding after the fact rather than anticipating the need is not particularly effective.

As I said, I believe we have a moral obligation to stand with Ukraine and help its people defend their way of life. We should not be in a position of telling President Zelenskyy: Yes, you have asked us for these defensive arms. You have asked us for these airplanes. We are going to give you just what we think you need.

I don't think that should be our position. We ought to ask President Zelenskyy what he needs and provide it forthwith.

We want to help Ukraine defeat Russian forces and repel them from their territory entirely, not just extend the length of this terrible war. The most effective way to do that is to supply Ukraine with the assets they need as quickly as possible.

To start with, the Biden administration should reevaluate its decision to reject Poland's aircraft offer. These airplanes are needed for Ukraine to maintain air superiority over Russian forces, and they need them now and not at some distant date in the future. And we need to continue to find ways to put American weaponry into the hands of Ukrainian soldiers.

Back in World War II, the United States was known as the arsenal of democracy. Again, in a bill that I have introduced called the Ukraine Democracy Defense Lend-Lease Act, we can do that again. I am proud to have worked with a group of bipartisan Senators, including Senators CARDIN, WICKER, and SHAHEEN, to produce this legislation.

This legislation authorizes the President to enter into lend-lease agreements like we did in World War II, which probably saved Britain from domination by Nazi Germany. We can do this again by providing Ukrainian forces with the weapons they need to defend their country.

This legislation was included in various packages designed to support Ukraine, but, unfortunately, those packages never made their way to the Senate floor.

There is broad bipartisan support for this lend-lease provision, and it will give the United States the ability to send the exact type of military support Ukraine needs without a lot of redtape or unnecessary delays.

Our support for Ukraine is not a provocation for Putin. It is a necessary show of strength, and it is a deterrence.

As we search for additional ways to support Ukraine, it was great to hear from President Zelenskyy. As I said earlier, his bravery and leadership have galvanized the world and have inspired all of us to take action. And I hope his plea for additional aid will persuade President Biden to act with even greater dispatch.

This weekend, I will be traveling with a number of our colleagues to Poland to visit our friends and allies on the ground and to see for ourselves the sort of humanitarian crisis that Putin's invasion of Ukraine has created.

Poland, to its credit, has welcomed thousands of refugees—hundreds of thousands—and continues to deal with the Russian aggression along its borders.

I look forward to this opportunity to visit both Poland and Germany and learning more from our partners in Europe and eager to bring back their input to the Senate for further urgent action.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Corley nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jacqueline Scott Corley, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.

VOTE ON CORLEY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Corley nomination?

Mr. LEAHY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 94 Ex.]

YEAS—63

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Romney
Booker	Hirono	Rosen
Brown	Kaine	Rounds
Burr	Kelly	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Capito	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lee	Smith
Casey	Luján	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Tillis
Cornyn	McConnell	Toomey
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden
Grassley	Padilla	Young

NAYS—36

Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blackburn	Hagerty	Portman
Blunt	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Kennedy	Shelby
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	Moran	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Shaheen

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Slaughter nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Fred W. Slaughter, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

VOTE ON SLAUGHTER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Slaughter nomination?

Mr. WARNER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 95 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Baldwin	Grassley	Padilla
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Hickenlooper	Romney
Brown	Hirono	Rosen
Cantwell	Kaine	Rounds
Capito	Kelly	Sanders
Cardin	King	Schatz
Carper	Klobuchar	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Sinema
Collins	Luján	Smith
Coons	Manchin	Stabenow
Cornyn	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden

NAYS—41

Barrasso	Hagerty	Portman
Blackburn	Hawley	Risch
Blunt	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Burr	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Toomey
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—2

Shaheen Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The majority leader.

AMERICA COMPETES ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have an announcement to make for the information of Senators. In a few moments, I will take the next procedural step to advance the jobs and competitiveness legislation so important to so many of us in this Chamber.

Last summer, the Senate passed an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill that will bring manufacturing jobs back to America, fix supply chains, fuel scientific research, and ultimately lower costs by a significant amount. The bipartisan bill will be great news for our economy, our entrepreneurs, our innovators, and especially families who are feeling the sting because of the chip shortage.

We all know the chip shortage is hurting so many people. It is hurting the auto industry that has had to temporarily shut down factories. It has hurt our tech industry, our healthcare industry, and so many others. So let's solve this quickly.

In order to go to conference, the Senate needs to amend the House-passed COMPETES bill with the Senate-passed U.S. Innovation and Competition Act and send it back to the House. That is what we will aim to do next week as quickly as we can.

Again, this jobs and supply chains legislation will help lower costs. Let us have bipartisan cooperation on this bill. Now, despite cloture, it is far better for Democrats and Republicans to reach an agreement to vote on this bill quickly, and we will keep working on that over the next few days.

It is regrettable that a small band of Republicans are determined to stand in the way of quick action after all the good work we have done in recent weeks passing bipartisan legislation. Let's add to that tally by quickly passing this bill. Creating jobs, lowering costs, and fixing supply chains shouldn't be partisan, and I hope to see an agreement to expedite this process soon. In the meantime, the process is moving forward.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

AMERICA CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR MANUFACTURING, PRE-EMINENCE IN TECHNOLOGY, AND ECONOMIC STRENGTH ACT OF 2022—Motion to Proceed

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521, to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521, a bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tammy Duckworth, Mark R. Warner, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jack Reed, Tina Smith, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Mazie K. Hirono, Mark Kelly, Tammy Baldwin, Jacky

Rosen, Ron Wyden, Margaret Wood Hassan, Maria Cantwell.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion filed today, March 17, be waived and that following the 1:45 p.m. vote, the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wyoming.

INFLATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about America's inflation crisis. People in my home State are noticing it every day.

This morning, the majority leader came to the floor and expressed his shock that prices have gone up, but they have been going up for over a year now. Price increases last year on energy alone cost hard-working families over $1,000 more last year—the first year that Joe Biden was President—compared to the previous year. This year, it is going to cost even more for energy—to drive, to heat, all of those things.

So I am glad that the Democrats now are—14 months into Joe Biden's Presidency—finally concerned about energy prices, but what we are seeing the Democrats offer are gimmicks.

Some Democrats want to call it a gas tax holiday. Of course, the gas tax is what is used to pay for our roads and bridges. So they want to defund—stop paying for roads and bridges but then put the gas tax back on right after the election. It is a cynical ploy.

Other Democrats say: No, no, let's not do that. Let's just send everybody more government checks.

Well, the Democrats have been doing that, and it is what has caused much of the inflation that we are facing today.

Still other Democrats say: No, no, no, let's clamp down on American energy even tighter.

These are nice sound bites. We are seeing them. We are hearing them. Those aren't solutions.

We know why prices are rising. Prices are rising because supply of American energy is down. We are actually 1.3 million barrels less energy producing now with oil in the United States than we were before the pandemic. So why is supply down? Well, the policies of the Democrats in the House and the Senate and the policies coming out of the White House. Democrats have been in charge of Washington now for a full year, and high prices are really the rotten fruit of Democrat rule.

As I said, we are at 1.3 million barrels of oil per day less than before the pandemic. People say: Well, what has caused it? Joe Biden was proud to talk about what has caused it. His first act as President was to stop oil and gas leases on Federal lands, kill the Keystone XL Pipeline, and it is one of his campaign promises. You can go back and look at the videos of Joe Biden as a campaigner saying: I promise you there will be no new oil and gas in the United States. That is actually what the video says, and that is what he says. They are his own words, his own promises. Then he went back to try to clarify that and clean it up a little bit, and he said: Well, not on public lands.

This isn't a surprise that Biden has crushed U.S. production of oil and gas. This administration still has not held a single auction for oil and gas leases on Federal lands since the day he has taken office. How does that compare to other administrations? Well, under President Obama, there were more than 30 oil and gas lease sales on Federal lands that had been conducted in the auctions in this same period of time.

So has anybody said anything about it? Actually, yes. The courts have ruled. The courts said the President's executive office on Federal land leases is illegal. That is what the courts ruled. President Biden thumbed his nose at the Federal courts. The President has stubbornly refused to open up more Federal lands to American energy production, ignoring what the courts have said.

In Western States like Wyoming, where half of our land is owned by the Federal Government, and controlled, it is devastating. Half of Wyoming is Federal land. We are sitting on a treasure trove of American energy. We wouldn't have to be relying on Vladimir Putin or we wouldn't have to be relying on Iran or going hat in hand to Venezuela. We have it here in America, and we do it a lot cleaner than they do in any of these foreign countries run by dictators.

When we keep energy buried in the ground, American families get buried in costs.

The White House says we don't need to open up Federal lands, no. The White House says there are oil and gas leases that are not being used—another sound bite. In reality, most of the leases that aren't being used—it is because they are tied up in Democrat red-tape or Democrat-run lawsuits.

There are some that aren't being used because the companies that have the leases can't get the funding to go and do the exploration. Why can't they get the funding? It is the cancel culture of the Democratic Party. We have seen it. Joe Biden's recent nominee to the Federal Reserve wrote in the New York Times that banks, she said, shouldn't lend money to oil and gas companies—shouldn't do it, period. These are businesses that get loans to do business, and she said: Nope, none for you. A lot of banks listened to her because they thought she was going to be confirmed. Thankfully, that nomination has been withdrawn.

Less investment means less production. It results in higher prices.

This morning, the majority leader, standing at that podium over there, also said gas prices had gone up ''at a time when families are already struggling.'' Well, why do you think they are already struggling? We know why they are struggling. It is because of the inflation caused by this administration and the policies that have been going on for a full year even though, month after month after month, the President of the United States said they would be transitory.

The price of gas has gone up. The price of heating in your home has gone up. The price of groceries has gone up. The price of nearly everything has gone up. Over the past year, prices have gone up 8 percent. We are at a 40-year high of inflation in this country. The average family's income cannot keep up with the price increases that we have been sustaining since the day Joe Biden took office. Just last month, some of the price increases were the biggest on record: chicken, lunch meat, baby food—things that people need to buy.

I am glad to hear that the Democrats are finally admitting the crisis is only going to get worse. Why do they say it is going to get worse? Because the cost of producing things has gone up. Energy prices are up; you use energy to produce things. The inflation cost for producing things now is actually higher based on—the price index for production is at 10 percent. So that says that prices are going to go up because if it costs more to produce things, the pricetag has to go up. Food costs continue to go up. Senator FISCHER, my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska, pointed out that fertilizer costs have tripled.

Now Democrats want to make it worse. Democrats in the House—not in the Senate but Democrats in the House—are asking Joe Biden to declare a climate emergency and tighten his choke hold on American energy production. It is going to make inflation even worse.

In yesterday's Washington Post, Larry Summers warned that we might face something, I say to the Presiding Officer, that you and I remember, something from the Jimmy Carter days called stagflation. That is where you have inflation and stagnation at the same time. It is a terrible thing to happen to an economy.

The crisis is only going to get worse. We need to change course. We need to do it now. Stop the reckless spending, and above all, unleash American energy. Don't be a country that not too long ago was asking Russia to produce more, asking OPEC to produce more, asking Iran to sell us energy, asking Venezuela. Produce it here. We have it here. Open up these Federal lands. Approve the drilling permits—the 4,600 drilling permits that are stuck in limbo by this administration.

American families cannot afford 3 more years of Joe Biden.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the

Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 677, Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Brian Schatz, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Chris Van Hollen, Raphael G. Warnock, Jacky Rosen, Tim Kaine, Patty Murray, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tammy Duckworth, Alex Padilla, Tammy Baldwin, Mazie K. Hirono, Christopher A. Coons, Patrick J. Leahy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 96 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Hassan	Padilla
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Rosen
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Cardin	Kennedy	Schumer
Carper	King	Sinema
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Luján	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warnock
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—5

Burr	Scott (SC)	Tillis
Manchin	Shaheen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). On this vote, the yeas are 51 the nays 44.

The motion is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

The Senator from Illinois.

SENATOR PAUL SIMON WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was fortunate early in my political life to meet several people who became my heroes and mentors and led me to take up public service as my life's calling.

The first was a Senator from Illinois named Paul Douglas, and I met him when I was a college intern in his office. And he introduced me to a man named Paul Simon; Simon, who was a Lieutenant Governor in our State, State legislator, Congressman, and, ultimately, the Senator who preceded me in this Senate seat.

After Paul Simon passed away, I approached his family and talked about a tribute to him, and they basically said: Well, you remember Paul. He would have been the last person in the world who ever wanted a statue and really didn't care much about having anything with his name on it. That just wasn't his approach to politics.

But I thought to myself there were some things that he valued that maybe I can try to help in my own way in his memory. And one of them was in 2014, when I introduced a bill called the Paul Simon Water for the World Act.

Simon had written a book that didn't make the New York Times best seller list. It was entitled ''Tapped Out.'' He had a theory many years ago that the issue with the 21st century was going to be water. And he made a pretty convincing case, and, frankly, the events and evidence since then have backed him up.

So this bill, the Paul Simon Water for the World Act, was designed to build on the success of an earlier effort called Paul Simon's Water for the Poor, which had passed 10 years before and sought to bring clean water and sanitation programs to the world's poorest communities.

Today, as we mark World Water Day, I want to recognize what we have accomplished with these two pieces of legislation. They have helped provide, for the first time, access to clean drinking water and sanitation for more than 60 million additional people around the globe.

Those successes have also improved global health, economic development, and educational attainment. And they have proven how far just a little Federal funding invested in the right area can go.

Both of those laws were passed on a bipartisan basis, and in recognizing the compounding benefits of clean water and sanitation, Congress has sustained the programs.

My staff has traveled to countries like Kenya, Ghana, Senegal to see these programs in action. They have shared stories and photos with me about schools and villages that, for the very first time, have access to clean, drinkable water.

In Ghana, for example, these laws have helped fund something called the Digni-Loo Program. It has provided rural villages with clean, sustainable toilets and helped eliminate waterborne diseases in entire districts of the country.

This World Water Day, I hope we can reaffirm our commitment in this Senate to supporting legislation in the name of my friend and mentor, the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act, that will help bring global health for years to come.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. President, in just a few days, America's eyes will turn to the Senate Judiciary Committee as we begin the process of considering Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson for her nomination to the Supreme Court.

It is going to be a historic moment on Monday as Judge Jackson appears before the Committee, and gaveling the hearing to order as chair of the committee will rank as one of the highest honors of my career in Congress.

Next week, the American people will have a chance to meet Judge Jackson, learn about her, her professional record, and her life experience. But, for now, let me briefly share a few things that have impressed me the most.

By now, I am sure, many have heard about her experience. Judge Jackson has clerked at every level of the Federal judiciary. Most lawyers would consider a clerkship in any court as an achievement that they could brag about for years. She served as a clerk at every level of the Federal judiciary, including the Supreme Court.

She served in many roles in the courtroom as a public defender, a lawyer in private practice, and a district and circuit court judge at the Federal level.

She was confirmed by the Senate unanimously to serve on the U.S. Sentencing Commission, and she would be the first Justice since Thurgood Marshall with considerable defense experience.

Her qualifications are exceptional. In every role she has held, she has earned a reputation for thoughtfulness, evenhandedness, and collegiality.

Just as impressive as Judge Jackson's record is her character and temperament—humble, personable. She has dedicated herself to making our legal system more understandable and more accessible for everyone who came into her courtroom.

Finally, of course, there is the perspective that Judge Jackson will bring to the High Court. Over the course of its history, 115 Justices have served on the Supreme Court. If she is confirmed, Judge Jackson will be the 116th, but she would be the first Supreme Court Justice who is the daughter of parents who felt the crushing oppression of segregation and the first Justice who has

represented an indigent as a public defender.

Judge Jackson comes from a law enforcement family and has a deep appreciation for the risk of police officers, like her brother and uncles. And I believe one served in the Baltimore Police Department.

Indeed, with Judge Jackson's confirmation, the Supreme Court would come closer to fully reflecting the diversity of America.

When Justice Breyer announced his retirement, I promised that the process for confirming his successor would be fair and timely. Well, it has been. For instance, the committee sent a bipartisan committee questionnaire to Judge Jackson. In response she provided materials which shed considerable light on her record, her accomplishments, her writings, and her legal reasoning. Notably, this included more than 12,000 pages of public records from Judge Jackson's time on the Sentencing Commission.

The committee also sent a bipartisan document request to the Obama Presidential Library. That request sought documents relating to Judge Jackson's nomination to both the Sentencing Commission and the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. In response to that request, the Obama Library produced more than 70,000 pages of material.

Additionally, Judge Jackson has written hundreds of opinions—almost 600 now—which provide extensive insight into her legal philosophy.

In short, the committee has all the information it needs to evaluate Judge Jackson's qualifications to sit on the Supreme Court.

We have sent a lot of followup requests for information, too, and she has always responded in a timely way.

So we are going to proceed with her hearing come Monday. This process will provide committee members an opportunity to question Judge Jackson to learn more about her approach to judicial decision making, her views on precedent, and her record on and off the bench.

Here is how the hearing is going to work. Each member of the committee will be allocated 10 minutes to make opening statements. Each member will have a total of 50 minutes to question Judge Jackson. There are 22 members on the committee. If you do the math, there is plenty of opportunity for questions to be asked and answered. I expect it to be a substantive hearing. I expect members on both sides of the aisle to ask tough but fair questions and to give her an appropriate time to respond, and I expect that the committee will diligently perform our role in the Senate's advice and consent function.

When the hearing is complete, I believe the American public will be keenly aware of just what an outstanding nominee Judge Jackson is. I will also get to see what I have seen in meeting with her personally. She is thoughtful, brilliant, kind, and has a good sense of humor.

She has already inspired young people across the country—young people who are just beginning to discover their passion for law. You see, she graduated from Miami's Palmetto Senior High School, a public high school in Pinecrest, FL. Right now, the halls of Palmetto High are buzzing with pride in anticipation for next week's hearing.

One school administrator told my office that, even though students will be out on spring break next week during beach season in Florida, many will be coming together for a virtual watch party as Judge Jackson appears before our committee. The administrator said that many of these students see themselves in Judge Jackson, particularly the members of the speech and debate team, which Judge Jackson was once a member of herself. In fact, Judge Jackson has cited her time on the speech and debate team as one of the most formative experiences of her life. She described it as ''the one activity that best prepared me for future success.''

Well, today, Judge Jackson is more prepared than perhaps anyone to serve on the Supreme Court. So to all the students at Palmetto High who are following in her footsteps, working long hours to hone their rhetorical skills, you are on the right track. While Judge Jackson may be the first Palmetto Panther to serve on the Supreme Court, there is no reason she should be the last. Years from now, who knows, maybe one of you will be preparing for your hearing before the Senate committee. Until then, you should all be so proud of Judge Jackson.

I would like to add another element to this—a personal element. When I spoke to Judge Jackson about her family, she was naturally proud of her husband, who is a surgeon, but she talked about her two daughters and showed me pictures of them. They are teenagers and obviously good kids. She is so proud of them. She told the story that when there was a vacancy announced on the Supreme Court several years ago, one of her daughters picked up a pen and wrote a personal letter to President Obama and said: Why don't you pick my mom?

It is that kind of support every parent lives for, and I am sure it means a lot to her. She is a good person, a good mother, a good parent, and she will be a great member of the Supreme Court.

I also want to say that there are elements that obviously the public has paid attention to. This being the fourth time before the Senate Judiciary Committee, many people in America know Judge Jackson or they have heard about her or they have read about her. They believe in a positive way that she will bring diversity to the Court; that she has the experience that is necessary to serve effectively; that she will uphold our constitutional values of liberty, equality, and justice; and that she will protect the constitutional rights of everybody, not just the wealthy and powerful. She has ethics and integrity, and she will place justice before politics.

I am looking forward to this hearing. I am happy that the Republicans have said publicly that they want to make it a respectful hearing, and I certainly hope they live up to it. I will do everything I can to convince the Democratic side to aspire to the same goal. This can be a historic moment for America in the selection of this Justice. I hope the Senate Judiciary Committee rises to the occasion, and I have confidence that it will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

NOMINATIONS OF CRISTINA SILVA AND ANNE TRAUM

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nominations of Judge Cristina Silva and Professor Anne Traum, nominees to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada. Both nominees have built tremendous careers and legal reputations, and, last night, cloture was invoked on both of these nominees with strong bipartisan support.

Judge Silva has spent the bulk of her career as a Federal prosecutor in the city of Las Vegas, where she served as chief of the criminal division. In this role, Judge Silva oversaw all criminal investigations and prosecutions in the Nevada U.S. Attorney's Office. She has gained vast experience dealing with Federal criminal trials, including violent criminal cases, civil rights violations, and cyber crime.

Since 2019, Judge Silva has served with distinction as a Nevada State court judge, where she has earned the respect and admiration of her colleagues, as well as those who have appeared before her in court. Colleagues have called her ''intellectually gifted and extremely hard-working'' and have commended her ''deep commitment to the rule of law.''

These are exactly the kinds of qualities we need in someone nominated to serve on the Federal Bench, and they are the qualities that Judge Silva exemplifies. I know she will serve with independence and integrity.

For her part, Professor Anne Traum has also developed a distinguished legal career, one rich with examples of her commitment to the law and to public service. She has litigated civil cases with the U.S. Attorney's office, served as a Department of Justice trial attorney, and has worked for years on criminal cases as a Federal public defender.

Since 2008, Professor Traum has dedicated her career to helping shape the minds of Nevada's future lawyers as a professor at the University of Nevada Las Vegas's Boyd School of Law.

A deeply admired teacher, Professor Traum has gone above and beyond, founding a clinic to provide legal services to parties in Las Vegas who lack resources and volunteering significant time to pro bono programs in Southern Nevada. Professor Anne Traum has

worked to ensure that all individuals have adequate representation to defend their rights and that all individuals have access to our justice system.

And there is no better way to judge a professor than by the opinion of her students. In Professor Traum's case, her students regularly credit her courses as the most important courses in their legal careers.

The bipartisan judicial selection committee that Senator CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO and I put together fully vetted both of these nominees, and we both worked hand in hand with the White House to ensure that they were chosen for their exemplary qualifications, intellect, and passion for the law.

I was glad to see that both Professor Traum's and Judge Silva's nominations received bipartisan support—both as they advanced through the Senate Judiciary Committee and during last night's cloture vote. These highly qualified nominees for the U.S. district court are fully deserving of your support now, and I urge each of my colleagues to vote for their confirmation next week.

Nevada's Federal district court has been under enormous strain, with delays driving up the costs to businesses and individuals pursuing their claims in court. Filling the vacancies with these nominees would ensure that Nevadans have fair and reasonable access to the Federal courts.

It is time to confirm these nominees, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of Judge Cristina Silva and Professor Anne Traum.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

PROXY WARS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, one of the challenges we face in this era of great power competition is identifying unique threats before they escalate.

When it comes to Russia and Ukraine, these threats have come into full focus. Vladimir Putin took off his statesman costume and declared a war of choice on Ukraine. Last week, we received the first public allegations of his intent to unleash Syrian proxies on anyone still standing between his war machine and the territory he covets.

I am glad to hear more of my colleagues speaking up about the unique dangers of proxy wars. Last week, I laid out in detail how Putin has used proxies to install himself in countries that are leadership poor but resource rich.

We know that fighters from the Kremlin-backed Wagner Group have slaughtered their way through Africa and the Middle East on behalf of Putin's grand Soviet ambition. And now he is going to do the very same thing in Ukraine.

We have also seen Iran unleash proxies and State-sponsored terror organizations in Iraq, against American Armed Forces and against civilian populations in Lebanon, Yemen, and Gaza.

In their 2022 threat assessment, the intelligence community stated:

> We assess that Iran will threaten U.S. persons directly and via proxy attacks, particularly in the Middle East.

This is a public statement. This is the Annual Threat Assessment. It is backed by years of evidence, proving that Iran has done this before and they are going to try to do it again.

President Biden should be doing everything in his power to keep this threat as far away from American citizens as he can—but no such luck. The impending nuclear deal he is trying to hand Tehran unlocks billions of dollars for Iranian banks, companies, and other entities that finance violence.

Where does the White House think that money will end up?

We know there is nothing Tehran loves more than a power vacuum. They have invested heavily in Hezbollah, the Houthis, and Hamas—all terrorist organizations hunkered down in some of the world's most unstable regions. Over the past decade, the Iranians have spent more than $16 million on carefully targeted bloodshed. That is right—Iran alone, the largest state sponsor of terrorism.

The landscape is chaos, and, still, the Biden administration is pushing the world toward a sanctions relief scheme that would empower the Iranians to terrorize and subjugate even more people.

The regime in Tehran is a menace. This week, incoming CENTCOM commander, General Kurilla, said as much in his confirmation hearing when we asked him how sanctions relief would affect the Iranian influence.

I am quoting him:

> [T]here is a risk with sanctions relief that Iran would use some of that money to support its proxies and terrorism in the region, and if it did, it could increase risk to our forces in the region.

In this week's CENTCOM posture review before the Armed Services Committee, outgoing commander, General McKenzie, acknowledged these concerns about sanctions relief, saying:

> [T]here is a risk that they could use that money in ways that we would not want them to use that money.

That is right. We certainly don't want them to put one more penny toward these proxy wars, for good reasons.

First, proxies don't just parachute in and declare victory. They brutalize entire populations and use weapons that these hostile regimes wouldn't normally have access to.

Second, because proxies operate outside the law, the rogue regimes that hire them maintain plausible deniability.

Third, this plausible deniability creates a false sense of security that allows hostile governments to pull up a chair to the negotiating table and pretend to fit in with normal countries, all the while denying the United States access and placement.

We have a limited number of ways to deter hostile regimes from waging war on the civilized world. The West failed the people of Ukraine in this regard, but it is not too late to change course.

Ronald Reagan once said:

> [W]ar comes not when the forces of freedom are strong, but when they are weak. It is then that tyrants are tempted.

He believed in achieving peace through strength, and so do I.

It is pretty simple. If you don't stand up for yourself, you will get run over, and if you don't stand up for your friends, there may not be anyone left to help them when the wolves are actually at the door.

When I talk to Tennesseans about this, the one thing they want to know is why President Biden makes decisions that make this country more vulnerable and less safe. Whether through lifting sanctions on Iran, slow-walking sanctions on Russia, or keeping our economy entangled with China's, Biden has refused to lead. Forget doing what needs to be done; he won't even say what needs to be said. He is fearful. He is scared to anger the new Axis of Evil. He is scared to anger our more timid allies in Europe. He is scared to anger the radical left here at home.

Is there anything that he is not afraid of?

He is so weak-kneed in the face of adversity that he can't even bring himself to finish building the fence that would secure our southern border.

I want to focus on that border security for just a few minutes because, while Russia and Iran might dominate headlines, for Tennesseans, our wide-open southern border is a perfect example of what can happen when a President concedes national security to score points on his political rivals.

Border encounters were up 2 percent in February. That is almost 165,000 people trying to enter the country unnoticed; 76 percent of the people the Border Patrol caught were single adults; cocaine seizures increased 83 percent; meth, 97 percent; heroin, 173 percent.

We know for a fact that terrorists and members of international criminal organizations cross our border with impunity. Over the course of 3 days last December, the Border Patrol arrested a guerrilla member of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, four MS–13 gang members, and an 18th Street gang member—six—six—distinguished representatives from the most dangerous gangs in the entire world and they almost disappeared into the country undetected. Thank goodness for law enforcement because these are not ordinary criminals.

In January of 2021, the Department of Justice indicted the 14 most senior members of MS–13 on charges of conspiracy to support, finance, and commit acts of terrorism.

Is this the Biden doctrine—choosing vulnerability over security and annihilation through weakness?

Who exactly does the President intend to win over with this approach?

Ukraine will find no peace in the easing of diplomatic tensions on some

U.N. panel. Children in Africa won't have a future if we start writing checks to proxy fighters. The people of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras won't be better off if we enable the drug dealers and sex traffickers who make a living exploiting their families. No matter where in the world you look, you can see the costs of Joe Biden's willful blindness to danger.

He has the tools he needs to protect the United States from these threats. Now, he needs to use them.

It is time to stop relying on foreign oil and make the country energy independent again: Finish the Keystone Pipeline. Do an Operation Warp Speed for energy. Allow oil and gas exploration on Federal land.

We have to stop leading from behind when it comes to preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

President Biden must submit to Congress any deal with Iran; and rest assured, we will block the implementation of anything the White House tries to sneak under the radar. We must pay attention to the flow of money and power in proxy hotbeds and recognize the danger posed by these terrorists for hire. We can't neglect security threats close to home. It is time to secure the border and give our law enforcement officials the resources they need to catch terrorists and gang members before they disappear into the country.

Tennesseans can't identify with the President's refusal to lead. They are confused and frightened, but they also have faith in our ability as a country to pull out of this skid. They believe in the promise of America. All they want is for their President and elected leaders to prove that they also believe in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Nebraska.

UKRAINE

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, I want to talk about three things.

First, Ukraine.

What do they need? How much aid? What kind, and how urgently can and should we get it to them?

Second, omnis.

Does the way the Congress spends money make any sense right now?

And, third, political grandstanding.

In particular, can politicians resist the short-term political crack that is social media?

First, Ukraine.

How much aid do they need? What kind and how urgently? The answer is they need everything, and they need it yesterday.

If they can shoot it, we should ship it. Ukrainians are fighting for freedom, and we should be doing more to help: Javelins, Stingers, lethal drones like Switchblades, surface-to-air missiles like the S–300s, coastal defense missiles, machine guns, ammo, grenade launchers, night vision goggles, and, yes, planes—more and more of them faster.

I applaud the President for some of what he has done, for sending some of this, but I would also note that there are really important weapons that are not yet in Ukrainian hands, like the S–300s.

I would also note that it takes time to cross the border, and we should be sending this stuff as fast as possible, not having the administration's lawyers debate how many angels can dance on the tip of a SAM or debate which weapons should be considered offensive versus defensive.

Look, the Ukrainians are the people who are being victimized; they are the people who have been invaded. Every weapon we give them right now is a defensive weapon. It is Russia that has invaded Ukraine, and these lawyerly distinctions don't really make a bit of difference to a Russian invading pilot. If he gets shot down, which weapons system it came from is not really the concern he is going to have at that moment.

So the answer to the question ''What kind of aid does Ukraine need?'' is more and faster.

Second, omnis.

Does the way the Congress works right now—does the way that we manage the power of the purse, does the way the appropriations process works—make any sense?

Can any of us go home and explain it to our constituents as the cautious, careful, prudent, adult management of the FISC? Obviously not. This process doesn't work.

I am 50 years old, and in the last 46 years—I think the current number is four times in the last 46 years that the Congress has spent at least 30 percent of its money under regular order on a regular appropriations process—four times in 46 years. This doesn't make sense. It is not prudent. It doesn't work.

For weeks, I have been calling on the President and his administration to submit an emergency supplemental to Congress so we can send Ukraine all of the aid they need faster.

Look, I am a fiscal hawk, but I am also a defense hawk, a security hawk, and I am A-OK with our spending a bunch of money fighting for the defense of freedom as long as the Ukrainians have fight in them. They are fighting not just for their kids and their future; they are fighting for free peoples. Putin will not be stopped until someone stops him. So the Ukrainians are doing a service to us—they are willing to fight. We should be willing to fund and to resupply them.

The reality is that my calls for an emergency supplemental were ignored. The administration didn't make any emergency supplemental request. The Congress's hands are not guilt-free either. We didn't even vote on an aid package for the Ukrainians until more than 2 weeks after the invasion.

Why the wait?

Washington did what it always does and decided it would just add the defense money to the orgy of spending and pet projects and bureaucracy—that we spend every year—in the middle of the night in a thousands-and-thousands-paged bill that not a single Member who voted on it here had actually read.

So what did we do with the Ukrainian aid?

The reality is there was some important aid in the omni, but we should talk about how much it was. We spent $13 billion on Ukrainian aid out of a total appropriations package of $1.5 trillion. For those of you doing math at home, that is less than 1 percent of what we passed in the middle of the night last week that was actually Ukrainian aid.

Here is a depiction: This is the aid bill, and this tiny, little subpiece of 1 percent is the portion that was Ukrainian aid.

The reality is that the bill we voted on last week wasn't really about Ukrainian aid. Ukrainian aid was a little bit of sugar on the larger medicine of a $1.5 trillion bill that nobody would actually want to go home and defend to the voters and to the taxpayers of America was well thought out.

So why does this happen?

Well, the American people aren't stupid. A lot of politicians think voters are stupid. They think you can jingle a shiny thing over here and then make up any claim you want, but the reality is voters aren't stupid. Voters are distracted, and they are busy, but they are not unaware of what is happening here.

They know why politicians talk like this—why they say that if you didn't vote for a $1.5 trillion bill, you were against puppies; you were against food for children; and you were against all of these really great ''mom and apple pie'' kinds of things when the reality is you probably voted against the bill because there was a whole bunch of schlock in it that was unvetted, not because you said: Hey, I don't want the Ukrainian freedom fighters to have the military aid that they need. People talk like this so that they can bully the other side.

This is, quite frankly, a boring speech. It is not a speech that I want to be giving. But the truth is, if you allow liars to constantly lie, and they can get away with it, then they just keep doing it. So it is probably useful for us more often to take people's nonsense tweets, which they do for a bizarre audience of political weirdoes on Twitter, and they should have to defend these statements in public.

It is transparently obvious that if you vote against a $1.5 trillion bill, that doesn't mean you were trying to vote against everything particularly in it; that you were against those kinds of funding. It might be because you were against lots of things in it that are indefensible before the voters. It is transparently stupid, and the voters get it.

So to the question of do omnis make sense? The answer is, no, we should do better.

But the question that our Republic is partly going to have to resolve if we are going to get healthy again as a polity is, Will politicians be able to resist the short-term crack of social media?

It doesn't look like very many of us in this body are interested in trying to speak to 70 and 75 and 80 percent of the electorate, but rather that lots and lots of politicians are completely happy to speak to the very narrow range of fan service that they do on Twitter.

Many politicians are addicted to Twitter. They want their sick burns and their retweets and their likes. It is crack and they have an addiction and it is sad.

The truth is that the folks who do this kind of garbage are hopelessly out of touch with the reality of the people's lives that we are actually supposed to be serving. It is not useful to drink your own bath water.

Twitter isn't real life, so it is probably useful for us to pause more often and try to make sure we have some common facts about the connection between political Twitter and reality.

First, only 20 percent of Americans are on Twitter—19 or 20 percent of Americans are on Twitter. Political Twitter is something like the ninth most watched portion of Twitter; sports Twitter, a foretaste of Heaven, unlike political Twitter, a foretaste of Hell. Sports Twitter is much bigger than political Twitter. Hollywood Twitter is bigger than political Twitter. K-pop Twitter is much, much bigger than political Twitter. So let's just start by recognizing that only 20 percent of Americans are on Twitter, and politics isn't a top five subportion of Twitter.

Of those who are on Twitter, only about 40 percent say they ever use Twitter for politics. But for the small minority of Americans who do pay attention to political Twitter—again, 40 percent of 20 percent—if you are doing math at home, we are now in single digits here. So 40 percent of 20 percent is 8 percent of Americans. For those who do pay attention to political Twitter, the political tweets are dominated by a very, very, very, very small share of American adults. Something like 80 percent of all tweets come from 10 percent of Twitter users. But this is the audience that politicians are playing for when they grandstand on Twitter.

Let's be clear, this happens all over the political continuum. This isn't chiefly on the right or chiefly on the left.

If you ever wonder why are politicians such weirdoes, it is mostly because they are grandstanding for a very, very narrow niche audience of weirdoes on Twitter, and so we should actually ask if it is healthy to continue doing that.

So to our core questions, the Ukrainians, do they need aid? Yes, they do. We should fund freedom fighters.

To the question of do omnis work? No, they don't, and everybody knows it.

But to the question of should we continue doing political discourse like this? Should we say that someone who had concerns about this was trying to kill off babies and puppies? No, we shouldn't lie like this. We shouldn't do that.

We owe the voters better than that. We should tell the truth, and we should try to talk to voters like you are actually talking to a room of regular people who have jobs and who are actually trying to put bread on the table for their kids and probably are pretty grateful for the inheritance that is the American Republic and our leadership on the global stage for freedom lovers.

The Ukrainians are that. We should fund the Ukrainians. We should have funded them in a more prudent way than an omni.

But if you voted for an omni when I voted against it, I am not going to attack you for voting for the omni. But don't go out there and lie and pretend that somebody who voted against the omni was against all the stuff in it, some of which is pretty decent.

We can do better. We should.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

REMEMBERING SONNY RUNDELL

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I rise this afternoon here among my colleagues and those back home in Kansas to pay tribute to a Kansan, Sonny Rundell.

Sonny passed away this past Friday at the age of 89, and I want to take a moment to recognize his life and his service. A moment is insufficient, certainly, to pay the tribute that this gentleman and his family deserve.

Sonny was born in Pierceville, KS, a little town in Southwest Kansas. In places as rural as Pierceville, people are sparse, and so you quickly learn what is important. And Sonny learned that in his life, family, church, community were the important things.

Sonny embodied qualities that fostered his community: hard work and generosity. And like so many young men of his generation, he was called to service to his country. In 1953, he answered that call and left to serve in Korea.

When he returned home to Kansas in 1956, he finished his degree at Kansas State University, earning a degree in agriculture. He went on to farm land in Hamilton, Stanton, and Finney Counties for more than 30 years.

Sonny was involved in so many ways. He was a churchgoer, and he cared about education advocacy throughout our State. He was a member of the State board of education and was an advocate for education for all kids in our State.

He had preceded that by being a member of the Syracuse, KS, Board of Education, the High Plains Special Education Cooperative. He was a founding member of Garden City Community College Board of Trustees, a founding member of the Education Equity Advisory Council, the Education Commission of the States, the Kansas Commission on Teaching and America's Future, and the National Association of State Boards of Education, and that is only to name a few.

Sonny recognized, as I hope we all do, that education is the great equalizing opportunity for Americans, for Kansans. It allows us to pursue what we call the American dream.

He received lots of recognitions during his life. He received those for his advocacy, and in 2003 Sonny was awarded the Governor's Award for Distinguished Service to Secondary Education in Kansas.

From 2000 to 2003, our country recognized 50 years since the Korean war. And during this time, the Republic of Korea issued a service medal and awarded those to veterans who had served, coordinating with congressional offices like mine. I was pleased to be able to recognize Sonny's service to our Nation.

Particularly in these troubled times, these days in which we see the surge for support for freedom, Sonny committed to doing so and served his Nation and the world in that cause of freedom.

In 2002, while I was still a Member of the House of Representatives here in the Nation's Capitol, I was pleased to be able to honor Sonny for his recognition during the Korean war.

Then and now, I thank him for his dedication to our State, and I thank him for his service to our Nation.

My prayers are with his wife Verna and to his entire family and loved ones.

Robba joins me in expressing our sincere condolences and wish those who remain to look at the life of Sonny Rundell and recommit ourselves to service to our community, to our family, and to our church.

REMEMBERING DICK HEDGES

Madam President, this afternoon I rise to pay tribute to a Kansan, a champion of the Fort Scott community, Dick Hedges.

In Kansas, we talk often of community and how important it is to the fabric of small towns that dot the State.

There are small towns in Southwest Kansas, and there are small towns in Southeast Kansas because in Kansas, those communities matter so much. We grew up knowing our neighbors and making the effort to get involved with those around us that ensure our smalltown survival.

Dick Hedges was a man who took that need for a strong community to heart and helped build the fabric of Fort Scott in so, so many ways.

Last night, I was reading the Fort Scott Tribune, and I read an article in tribute to Dick. Its headline read: ''Man who shared so much is remembered.'' It is a pretty good headline to have upon your death, ''shared so much.''

Dick was a coach, a teacher, a vice principal, a principal, a college president; he was a member of the community civic clubs and a churchgoer; he

served on local boards; he wrote for local papers; and he championed the arts in and around Fort Scott.

In 2018, he even opened a local book store because the community needed one. He was a man who shared so much of himself: his time, his love, his experience, his loyalty, and his commitment to others.

He was an advocate for athletics and sportsmanship and the way it could influence young students in a positive way. For 40 years, he shared his life with purpose and continually found new ways to do so.

But to Dick, I expect that was his definition of ''community,'' sharing oneself for the betterment of others with the expectation that they, too—the people whom you help—may pay it forward.

Dick has impacted the lives of so many, so many throughout his life, and his life gives me hope for others like him in towns across Kansas and around the country.

My prayers are with his wife Jan, the Fort Scott community, and his entire family and loved ones.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UKRAINE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I got the chance to hear some of Senator SASSE's remarks. I noted the floor chart with my name on it, accusing me of what he called tribal hackery.

I am not exactly sure what the rules of the Senate are. I am not sure that that is becoming of the U.S. Senate to use those terms about fellow Members, but let me come down to the floor to explain why I think we should have a legitimate debate in this Chamber about a phenomenon in which Republicans very often are not willing to cast their vote in a way that is aligned with their voice.

Yes, I noted this morning—as was displayed on Senator SASSE's chart—that this week, of the Republicans who stood up at a press conference and eviscerated President Biden's handling of the Ukraine crisis, two-thirds of them voted against the budget that included $14 billion of aid to Ukraine. I see a fundamental inconsistency in criticizing an administration for not doing enough but then not being willing to cast a vote to get aid to the people of Ukraine.

Senator SASSE's second chart—the one that didn't accuse me of tribal hackery—laid out a very true statement, in which a small percentage of the overall budget is dedicated to Ukraine aid. That is, of course, true.

But the reason why I find it concerning that Members of the Senate who, I take their word for it, are genuinely interested in getting help to the people of Ukraine are then voting against the budget that delivers it, is because it speaks to a broader problem in the Senate today, which is a lack of interest in compromise, a lack of interest in finding a result—a fealty to the perfect and an antagonism to the good.

Mr. SASSE. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Sure, I would be happy to yield.

Senator SASSE, I was going to try to respond to your critique, but I am happy to yield at this point.

Mr. SASSE. So let me just see if I understand what you just said.

Eight-tenths of 1 percent of the bill that was passed in the middle of the night last week is about Ukraine aid. Do you believe that the people who voted against it voted against it because they were against Ukrainian aid?

Mr. MURPHY. So every one of us approaches a big—

Mr. SASSE. I am asking a really simple question: Do you think a single person that your Twitter self-pleasuring was for—do you think a single person that voted against it voted against it because they were against Ukrainian aid?

Mr. MURPHY. Absolutely not.

Mr. SASSE. So, then, what is the point of the tweet?

Mr. MURPHY. The point is that the only way that this place passes legislation is compromise, is voting on pieces of legislation that have in it things that——

Mr. SASSE. What are the pieces, dude? It is $1.5 trillion.

Mr. MURPHY. Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I would ask the Senators to direct their questioning to the President and give the Senators the decorum to respond.

Mr. MURPHY. So inside every piece of legislation are elements that many of us disagree with, right? Inside that budget that you voted against are all sorts of things that I disagree with. But, in the end, in order to govern the country, you have to be able to find a path to compromise.

And what I have found, over the time that I have been here, is that there is a pathway to getting things done. It generally involves 90 to 100 percent of Democrats and a small slice of Republicans. It is increasingly hard to find compromise that involves more than 10 or 15 Republicans because, as you state, inside these pieces of legislation there are things to disagree with, right? There are things that you find objectionable.

So while, in the past, I think people would set aside some of the things that they weren't happy about in the interest of the greater good, today there seems to be a higher bar, and the result is that it is just a lot harder to get things done.

Now, on the budget, luckily there were enough of us that were willing to celebrate the good, as opposed to the perfect, in order to get that budget passed and significant aid to the Ukrainian people across the finish line.

My worry is that, as time goes on, there will be an inability to find those coalitions and that we will be stuck in a world in which you can't get Federal budgets done, you can't get big pieces of legislation done because there isn't that interest in compromise that is necessary sometimes to get passed a big package like the one that we passed earlier this week.

Mr. SASSE. When you are willing, if I may.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, Senator SASSE.

Mr. SASSE. I think there are three topics. Argue with me if I misread the three topics before us.

One is Ukrainian aid. I don't think we differ. And the reason I came to make a speech—and you and I have talked about this offline multiple times in the past. Let me name the three: One, there is Ukrainian aid. Two, there is the budgeting and appropriations process. And, three, there is the grandstanding that happens for audiences that don't have anything to do with persuading a single human being that is called to work in this space.

In bucket one, I think you know that not a person who voted against it—the omni—voted against it because of the Ukrainian aid. So I think it is a dishonest argument.

In bucket two, which—well, I am jumping in and you have the floor; so I will give it back to you. But, in bucket two, you have repeatedly used the term ''people won't vote for something because it is not perfect.'' I think that, if we could put the appropriations process of the U.S. Congress up to the American people for a referendum, the idea that you want to give it a B-plus or an A-minus, I submit you should take that to the voters of Connecticut and try to persuade them of that, because I am going to guess that, whatever the overall approval rating is of Congress, it bounces around between like 9 and 15 percent. My guess is, the way we spend money, it is lower than that. So I don't think you want to give yourself an 86 or a 92 or a 95 percent because it is not perfect. It is obviously an F. The way that we spend money here is not deliberative; it is not thought out. It is always thousands of pages that come out in the middle of the night, and it always votes.

So to your point, that you said budgets pass around here with 50 of 50 Democrats and 10 or 12 of 50 Republicans, that is true. We do have a philosophical difference about whether or not the appropriations process works.

I think you are the one voting on the side that is misaligned with both fiscal reality and the role of the American people. But I didn't come to beat you up about voting.

I am supposed to direct it to the President.

Madam President, I don't think the Senator from Connecticut is on the floor because I came to attack him for voting for the omni. I didn't. He misrepresented why some people who voted against the omni were dishonest by saying they were for more Ukrainian aid when there was Ukrainian aid in this budget.

But the real thing we are talking about is grandstanding, because there is not a person on Earth who is persuaded by that kind of tweet. You

didn't move anybody. You are doing fan service for a subset of people who like CHRIS MURPHY. I get why some people would like things that you stand for and advocate for. I get it.

But there is not a person who disagreed with you who is moved because of a tweet like that. There is not an uninformed American who became informed. But there is a subset of the people who already like you that you got to grandstand for. That is all that happened with that tweet. The Republic got dumber because of that tweet. Nobody learned anything.

Mr. MURPHY. Reclaiming my time. Listen, I understand that Republicans would love for this inconvenient truth not to be pointed out for them—right?—the fact that they are eviscerating the President at press conferences for the crisis in Ukraine. There were Members at that press conference that Senator SASSE attended that said, if not for President Biden, this invasion would have never happened; that it was his fault.

Mr. SASSE. Not my view.

Mr. MURPHY. That might not have come from Senator SASSE's mouth, but there were others at that press conference—right?—who have repeatedly blamed this entire crisis not on Vladimir Putin but on Joe Biden's policies. And I do think it is convenient for Republicans to consistently eviscerate the President for his conduct but then not be willing to cast the difficult votes necessary to help the President effectuate a policy there.

The consequence of a ''no'' vote on that budget, whether you like it or not, was that assistance money not getting to Ukraine. There wasn't another vote in front of us. The only choice that this Senate had was, Do we support a piece of legislation that includes necessary money——

Mr. SASSE. Will the gentleman yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is out of order.

Mr. MURPHY. I let the Senator finish.

The choice before this Senate was, Are we going to support a piece of legislation that includes the necessary money in order to allow for Ukraine to defend itself and for this administration to get emergency resources, or are we going to vote it down?

And I understand that the American public are rightly upset about the way in which we budget. But, on that day, there was one choice before this body.

So I do see that there is an inherent contradiction between Republicans standing up at press conferences, which, frankly, are speaking most often to the same audience that you believe that my tweets are speaking to, right? Most often, these press conferences are designed to rally the faithful.

So I think it is a bit sanctimonious to suggest that only one of us in this Chamber is involved in preaching to the choir. Much of the engagement in press conferences here, around this issue of Ukraine, ends up speaking to base audiences, and the message being sent to that audience is that President Biden isn't doing enough.

And then, when we had an opportunity to pass bipartisan legislation to give him the tools to do more, the same Republicans that were at that press conference criticizing the President decided—and, I submit to you, for legitimate reasons having nothing to do with the Ukraine money—to cast a vote that had the consequence, if it was the majority position in this body, to disapprove of that money, to reject that money.

Mr. SASSE. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator yield his time——

Mr. MURPHY. I would.

Mr. SASSE. I would direct a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER.—for a question?

The Senator from Nebraska.

And I would ask both Senators to direct their remarks to the President, please.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, I would ask the Senator from Connecticut to explain to me why the only choice was $1.5 trillion or zero. The Senate could work its will and have passed the $13.6 billion of aid money 10 minutes later.

Madam President, could the Senator from Connecticut explain to me this apparent—to me, false—choice between $1.5 trillion and zero. Why were there no other options?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut wish to respond to the question?

Mr. MURPHY. I will. Thank you, Madam President.

The Senator is exactly right. Not only was there another option—pass the Ukraine supplemental on its own—there were a million other options. Right? There are always different ways that we can do things, and that is always a reason to vote no.

I could always choose to vote no on a measure before us because I can dream up of a scenario in which the outcome would be better aligned with my priorities. I think that is a very convenient reason to defend a ''no'' vote: that there is a theoretical outcome that would be more in alignment with your beliefs.

That is not how things work here, right? We are presented with pieces of legislation we all have input into. This was not a Democratic bill. This was a bill worked out with many Republicans as well. And ultimately we had a choice. We had a choice.

And, again, I think it is a lot easier to just come down here to vote no on everything. But when life and death are at stake in a place like Ukraine, I think, on the willingness to support a piece of legislation that maybe has some things in it you don't like, the bar may be a little bit higher.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield his time for a question?

Mr. MURPHY. I don't think I have anybody seeking to yield at this point.

Let me say this. I take Senator SASSE's position seriously, and I want him to take my position seriously, as well, because I object to the idea of my effort to draw attention to the fact that Republicans voted against a bill that includes significant money for Ukraine as political hackery. I object to that characterization because I do think I am speaking to a broader trend line in this body, in which it is seemingly harder than ever to get both sides to the table to agree to big things that change people's lives or change realities overseas.

I think Senator SASSE makes an important point, which is the way we are doing things right now with respect to the budget is insanity. I agree with that. The lack of transparency, the fact that all of this work is shopped to the majority and the minority leaders—that is not good for government; that is not good for transparency. I think there are legitimate reasons why Members of this body would vote against the budget.

But that is not what my statement was about. It was about trying to juxtapose that vote to this criticism of the President. I do think those two things are relevant because the American public is being given the impression by many Republicans that the President isn't being serious enough about this crisis or isn't working hard enough at this crisis.

And I do think it is legitimate to put on the table for a discussion the fact that the very people who are criticizing the President's conduct are often not willing to support the funding necessary for him to carry out that mission—for reasons that have nothing to do with Ukraine but have, in the end, the effect of denying the President, if this position was the majority—it was not last week—given that the consequence of voting down the budget would have been to ultimately deny that funding to the President and to the people of Ukraine.

I think this is a legitimate topic for discussion, and I will continue to raise it. I will take the Senator's word seriously and try to raise it in a way that is constructive, but I think this is a legitimate topic for discussion in the U.S. Senate.

This is not about rallying the base. This is about trying to promote a discussion about how we make this place more functional and how these press conferences that Republicans are doing end up having some connection to the reality of the votes that happen on the floor of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, in the interest of comity, I will underscore three points of agreement from Senator MURPHY's last few minutes there, as well, just as a way to close us out.

No. 1, I agree with the Senator that there is a lot of grandstanding all over

political theater right now, and that certainly includes people on my side of the aisle who have tried to imply that pieces of this are President Biden's fault that aren't President Biden's fault; that the evildoer here is Vladimir Putin, who is targeting women and children; and Americans should be on the same team against that evil.

So to the degree that the Senator is partly motivated by frustration with some grandstanding that he has seen by people who have an ''R'' behind their name, I agree.

Second point: I am for this funding, and my criticism of the Biden administration has not been because they wouldn't support funding. In the intel space, there are a whole bunch of arguments and fights we have been having that we can't talk about in this setting but where I just want them to go faster.

But the idea that the problem with the administration, from my point of view, is an unwillingness to fund—that isn't my position, and so the Senator and I are united that that would be an unfair criticism of the Biden administration.

And third and finally, he called our budgeting and appropriations process ''insanity.'' Let's put a pin in that because what I was voting against last week was not done for the purposes of saying the Ukrainian aid money shouldn't move, but it is saying that an insane budget process shouldn't work this way, where the American people can't get access into other monies being spent. And we have 12 or 13 subcommittees of the appropriations process, and we almost never get to vote bill by bill.

I would gladly have us stay here 24/7 for 2, 3, 4 weeks—however long it took. And if we had to cast not just 12 or 13 subcommittee approps packages, but if we had to vote on hundreds or thousands of things item by item—it is a pretty clunky process but a much better process than we have right now, which the Senator from Connecticut rightly described is ''insane.'' On that we agree. Thank you for engaging.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). The Senator from Nevada.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 794, 795, 796, and 797; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc, without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Bidtah N. Becker, of Arizona, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022 (New Position); Gretchen Gonzalez Davidson, of Michigan, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022; Vanessa Northington Gamble, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2026; and David Anthony Hajdu, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2026?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

SAFE CONNECTIONS ACT OF 2021

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 193, S. 120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 120) to prevent and respond to the misuse of communications services that facilitates domestic violence and other crimes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Safe Connections Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, terms used in this Act that are defined in section 344(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, have the meanings given those terms in such section 344(a).

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual assault, human trafficking, and related crimes are life-threatening issues and have lasting and harmful effects on individuals, families, and entire communities.

(2) Survivors often lack meaningful support and options when establishing independence from an abuser, including barriers such as financial insecurity and limited access to reliable communications tools to maintain essential connections with family, social safety networks, employers, and support services.

(3) Perpetrators of violence and abuse described in paragraph (1) increasingly use technological and communications tools to exercise control over, monitor, and abuse their victims.

(4) Communications law can play a public interest role in the promotion of safety, life, and property with respect to the types of violence and abuse described in paragraph (1). For example, independent access to a wireless phone plan can assist survivors in establishing security and autonomy.

(5) Safeguards within communications services can serve a role in preventing abuse and narrowing the digital divide experienced by survivors of abuse.

SEC. 4. PROTECTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SURVIVORS WITHIN COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.

Part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 344. PROTECTION OF SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, HUMAN TRAFFICKING, AND RELATED CRIMES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ABUSER.—The term 'abuser' means an individual who has committed or allegedly committed a covered act against—

''(A) an individual who seeks relief under subsection (b); or

''(B) an individual in the care of an individual who seeks relief under subsection (b).

''(2) COVERED ACT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered act' means conduct that constitutes—

''(i) a crime described in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(a)), including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking;

''(ii) an act or practice described in paragraph (11) or (12) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102) (relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons and sex trafficking, respectively); or

''(iii) an act under State law, Tribal law, or the Uniform Code of Military Justice that is similar to an offense described in clause (i) or (ii).

''(B) CONVICTION NOT REQUIRED.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to require a criminal conviction or any other determination of a court in order for conduct to constitute a covered act.

''(3) COVERED PROVIDER.—The term 'covered provider' means a provider of a private mobile service or commercial mobile service, as those terms are defined in section 332(d).

''(4) PRIMARY ACCOUNT HOLDER.—The term 'primary account holder' means an individual who is a party to a mobile service contract with a covered provider.

''(5) SHARED MOBILE SERVICE CONTRACT.—The term 'shared mobile service contract'—

''(A) means a mobile service contract for an account that includes not less than 2 consumers; and

''(B) does not include enterprise services offered by a covered provider.

''(6) SURVIVOR.—The term 'survivor' means an individual who is not less than 18 years old and—

''(A) against whom a covered act has been committed or allegedly committed; or

''(B) who cares for another individual against whom a covered act has been committed or allegedly committed (provided that the individual providing care did not commit or allegedly commit the covered act).

''(b) SEPARATION OF LINES FROM SHARED MOBILE SERVICE CONTRACT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 business days after receiving a completed line separation request from a survivor pursuant to subsection (c), a covered provider shall, as applicable, with respect to a shared mobile service contract under which the survivor and the abuser each use a line —

''(A) separate the line of the survivor, and the line of any individual in the care of the survivor, from the shared mobile service contract; or

''(B) separate the line of the abuser from the shared mobile service contract.

''(2) LIMITATIONS ON PENALTIES, FEES, AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—A covered provider may not make the separation of a line from a shared

mobile service contract under paragraph (1) contingent on any requirement other than the requirements under subsection (c), including—

''(A) payment of a fee, penalty, or other charge;

''(B) maintaining contractual or billing responsibility of a separated line with the provider;

''(C) approval of separation by the primary account holder, if the primary account holder is not the survivor;

''(D) a prohibition or limitation, including one described in subparagraph (A), on number portability, if such portability is technically feasible, or a request to change phone numbers;

''(E) a prohibition or limitation on the separation of lines as a result of arrears accrued by the account;

''(F) an increase in the rate charged for the mobile service plan of the primary account holder with respect to service on any remaining line or lines; or

''(G) any other limitation or requirement not listed under subsection (c).

''(3) RESPONSIBILITY FOR TRANSFERRED TELEPHONE NUMBERS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), beginning on the date on which a covered provider transfers billing responsibilities for and rights to a telephone number or numbers to a survivor under paragraph (1)(A) in response to a line separation request submitted by the survivor under subsection (c), the survivor shall assume financial responsibility, including for monthly service costs, for the transferred telephone number or numbers.

''(4) RESPONSIBILITY FOR TELEPHONE NUMBERS TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER SERVICE PROVIDER.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), upon the transfer of a telephone number under paragraph (1)(B) in response to a line separation request submitted by a survivor under subsection (c), the survivor shall have no further financial responsibilities for the telephone number or for any mobile device associated with the telephone number.

''(5) NOTICE TO SURVIVOR.—If a covered provider separates a line from a shared mobile service contract under paragraph (1) and the primary account holder is not the survivor, the covered provider shall notify the survivor of the date on which the covered provider intends to give any formal notice to the primary account holder.

''(c) LINE SEPARATION REQUEST.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A survivor seeking relief under subsection (b) shall submit to the covered provider a line separation request that—

''(A) verifies that an individual who uses a line under the shared mobile service contract has committed or allegedly committed a covered act against the survivor or an individual in the survivor's care, by providing—

''(i) a copy of a signed affidavit from a licensed medical or mental health care provider, licensed military medical or mental health care provider, licensed social worker, licensed victim services provider, or licensed military victim services provider, or an employee of a court, acting within the scope of that person's employment; or

''(ii) a copy of a police report, statements provided by police, including military police, to magistrates or judges, charging documents, protective or restraining orders, military protective orders, or any other official record that documents the covered act;

''(B) in the case of relief sought under subsection (b)(1)(A), with respect to—

''(i) a line used by the survivor that the survivor seeks to have separated, states that the survivor is the user of that specific line; and

''(ii) a line used by an individual in the care of the survivor that the survivor seeks to have separated—

''(I) includes an affidavit setting forth that the individual is in the care of the survivor; and

''(II) a statement that the individual is the user of that specific line; and

''(C) requests relief under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(1) and identifies each line that should be separated.

''(2) REMOTE OPTION.—A covered provider shall offer a survivor the ability to submit a line separation request under paragraph (1) through secure remote means that are easily navigable.

''(3) ENHANCED PROTECTIONS UNDER STATE LAW.—This subsection shall not affect any law or regulation of a State providing communications protections for survivors (or any similar category of individuals) that has less stringent requirements for providing evidence of a covered act (or any similar category of conduct) than this subsection.

''(d) CONFIDENTIAL AND SECURE TREATMENT OF PERSONAL INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding section 222(b), a covered provider shall treat any information submitted by a survivor under subsection (c) as confidential and securely dispose of the information not later than 90 days after receiving the information.

''(e) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION TO CONSUMERS.—A covered provider shall make information about the options and process described in subsections (b) and (c) readily available to consumers—

''(1) on the website and any mobile application of the provider;

''(2) in physical stores; and

''(3) in other forms of public-facing consumer communication.

''(f) TECHNICAL INFEASIBILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The requirement to effectuate a line separation request pursuant to subsection (b)(1) shall not apply to a covered provider if the covered provider cannot operationally or technically effectuate the request.

''(2) NOTIFICATION.—If a covered provider cannot operationally or technically effectuate a line separation request as described in paragraph (1), the covered provider shall notify the individual who submitted the request of that infeasibility as soon as is reasonably possible, and in any event not later than 48 hours after receiving the request.

''(g) LIABILITY PROTECTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered provider and any officer, director, employee, vendor, or agent thereof shall not be subject to liability to a survivor or any other person for any claims deriving from an action taken or omission made with respect to compliance with subsection (c).

''(2) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority of the Commission to prosecute violations of this section or any rules or regulations promulgated by the Commission pursuant to this section.''.

SEC. 5. RULEMAKING ON PROTECTIONS FOR SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(2) the term ''Commission'' means the Federal Communications Commission;

(3) the term ''covered hotline'' means a hotline related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, sex trafficking, severe forms of trafficking in persons, or any other similar act;

(4) the term ''Lifeline program'' means the program set forth in subpart E of part 54 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation); and

(5) the term ''text message'' has the meaning given the term in section 227(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)).

(b) RULEMAKINGS.—

(1) HOTLINE CALLS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall commence a rulemaking to consider whether to—

(i) require providers of wireless communications services or wireline voice services to omit from consumer-facing logs of calls or text messages any records of calls or text messages to covered hotlines, while maintaining internal records of those calls and messages; and

(ii) establish, and provide for updates on a quarterly basis of, a central database of covered hotlines to be used by providers of wireless communications services or wireline voice services in complying with the rule described in clause (i).

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—The rulemaking conducted under subparagraph (A) shall include consideration of—

(i) the ability of law enforcement agencies or survivors to access a log of calls or text messages in a criminal investigation or civil proceeding;

(ii) the ability of providers of wireless communication services or wireline voice services to—

(I) identify logs that are consumer-facing; and

(II) omit certain consumer-facing logs, while maintaining internal records of such calls and text messages; and

(iii) any other factors associated with the implementation of clauses (i) and (ii) to protect survivors of domestic violence, including factors that may impact smaller providers.

(C) NO EFFECT ON LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to—

(i) limit or otherwise affect the ability of a law enforcement agency to access a log of calls or text messages in a criminal investigation; or

(ii) alter or otherwise expand provider requirements under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (Public Law 103–414; 108 Stat. 4279) or the amendments made by that Act.

(2) LINE SEPARATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall adopt rules to implement section 344 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In adopting rules under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consider—

(i) privacy protections;

(ii) account security and fraud detection;

(iii) account billing procedures;

(iv) liability;

(v) procedures for notification of survivors about line separation processes;

(vi) the requirements for remote submission of a line separation request, including how that option facilitates submission of verification information and meets the other requirements of section 344 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act;

(vii) implementation timelines, based on provider size and geographic reach;

(viii) notice to account holders;

(ix) situations in which a covered provider cannot operationally or technically separate a telephone number or numbers from a shared service plan such that the provider cannot effectuate a line separation request;

(x) financial responsibility for transferred telephone numbers; and

(xi) whether and how the survivor can elect to take financial responsibility for the mobile device associated with the separated line.

(3) LIFELINE PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, or as part of a general rulemaking proceeding relating to the Lifeline program set forth in subpart E of part 54 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), whichever occurs earlier, the Commission shall adopt rules that allow a survivor suffering from financial hardship who meets the requirements under section 344(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, without regard to whether the survivor meets the otherwise applicable eligibility requirements of the Lifeline program, to—

(i) enroll in the Lifeline program as quickly as is feasible; and

(ii) participate in the Lifeline program based on such qualifications for not more than 6 months.

(B) EVALUATION.—Not later than 2 years after completing the rulemaking under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall—

(i) evaluate the effectiveness of the Commission's provision of support to survivors through the Lifeline program;

(ii) assess the detection and elimination of fraud, waste, and abuse with respect to the support described in clause (i); and

(iii) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the evaluation and assessment described in clauses (i) and (ii), respectively.

(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the ability of a survivor who meets the requirements under section 344(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, to participate in the Lifeline program indefinitely if the individual otherwise qualifies for the Lifeline program under the rules of the program.

(D) NOTIFICATION.—A provider of wireless communications services that receives a line separation request pursuant to section 344 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, shall inform the individual who submitted the request of—

(i) the existence of the Lifeline program;

(ii) who qualifies to participate in the Lifeline program; and

(iii) how to participate in the Lifeline program.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The requirements under section 344 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, shall take effect 60 days after the date on which the Federal Communications Commission adopts the rules implementing that section pursuant to section 5(b)(2) of this Act.

SEC. 7. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to abrogate, limit, or otherwise affect the provisions set forth in the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (Public Law 103–414; 108 Stat. 4279) and the amendments made by that Act, any authority granted to the Commission pursuant to that Act or the amendments made by that Act, or any regulations promulgated by the Commission pursuant to that Act or the amendments made by that Act.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be withdrawn; that the substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 5001), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 120), as amended, was passed.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI AND AMERICORPS SENIORS VOLUNTEERS

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 551, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 551) recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers to the lives of the people of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 551) was agreed to.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MORNING BUSINESS

INCREASING MEMBERSHIP TO THE SENATE NATO OBSERVER GROUP

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, due to the current events happening in Europe, the Republican leader and I have agreed to increase the membership to the Senate NATO Observer Group by two additional Senators. The additional Democratic Senator will be named at a later date.

INCREASING MEMBERSHIP TO THE SENATE NATO OBSERVER GROUP

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, due to the current events happening in Europe, the Majority Leader and I have agreed to increase the membership of the Senate NATO Observer Group by two additional Senators. For the additional Republican Senator, I ask that Senator MORAN be added to participate in the group.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week, the Senate will consider 12 outstanding judicial nominees. These nominees represent the continued efforts of President Biden and Senate Democrats to bring much-needed professional and demographic diversity to the Federal bench.

This latest lineup of nominees include legal academics, public defenders, civil rights lawyers, sitting State and Federal judges, prosecutors, and private practitioners. Each of these nominees has the character, temperament, and qualifications to serve with distinction.

The first nominee is Judge Jacqueline Corley, nominated to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

For more than a decade, Judge Corley has served as a Federal magistrate judge in the Northern District of California. She has handled cases implicating a variety of complex statutory and constitutional questions, from immigration to employment to national security matters. And in her time on the bench, she has amassed a record that reflects her evenhanded, impartial approach to the law. Earlier in her career, Judge Corley spent nearly two decades working in private legal practice and as a career law clerk to Judge Charles Breyer, who also serves on the Northern District of California.

Judge Corley received a unanimous rating of ''Well Qualified'' from the American Bar Association, has the strong support of Senators FEINSTEIN and PADILLA, and received overwhelming bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee.

Next, we have Fred Slaughter, who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California.

Judge Slaughter currently serves as a judge on the California Superior Court for Orange County. In 2014, Governor Jerry Brown appointed him to this position, and since then, Judge Slaughter has presided over a wide variety of cases, including civil cases, felony criminal cases, and juvenile justice proceedings. After graduating from the UCLA School of Law, he started his career as a deputy city attorney with the Los Angeles City Attorney's office, before moving to the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Central District of California as an Assistant U.S. Attorney. He prosecuted a wide range of cases and developed a deep understanding of the district to which he has been nominated.

Judge Slaughter has the strong support of both his home-State Senators, Mrs. FEINSTEIN and Mr. PADILLA, and he was rated unanimously ''Well Qualified'' by the American Bar Association. His deep commitment to public service, coupled with his broad experience, makes him an excellent nominee to the Federal bench.

The Senate will also consider the nomination of Ruth Montenegro to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California.

Since 2018, Judge Montenegro has served as a U.S. magistrate judge in the Southern District of California. Prior to that, she served as a State court judge. With her combined experience on federal and State courts, Judge Montenegro has been on the bench for nearly 8 years. She has presided over thousands of cases, including more than 30 jury trials and over 100 bench trials.

Judge Montenegro was unanimously rated ''Qualified'' by the American Bar

Association, and both Senators FEINSTEIN and PADILLA strongly support her nomination. A graduate of UCLA School of Law, Judge Montenegro worked as an attorney for more than 19 years before assuming the bench.

Judge Montenegro is also the child of immigrants and a first-generation college graduate. Throughout her career, she has made it a priority to give back to the community. In 2018, she served as chair of the California Bar Foundation's scholarship committee, and, for many years, she served as president and chair of the scholarships committee for the El Centro Education Foundation.

Judge Montenegro was voted out of the Judiciary Committee with bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

Next is Victoria Calvert, nominated to be a judge on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. Ms. Calvert is a highly experienced litigator with a proven commitment to ensuring equal justice for all.

Ms. Calvert attended Duke University and received her law degree from the New York University School of Law. She then spent 6 years working in private practice before dedicating her career to public service. Currently, she serves as a staff attorney with the Federal defender program in the Northern District of Georgia, a position she has held since 2012. In this role, she has represented hundreds of indigent clients. Ms. Calvert has the strong support of her home-State Senators, Mr. OSSOFF and Mr. WARNOCK. And she received a unanimous ''Well Qualified'' rating from the ABA.

I have said many times that public defenders are vastly underrepresented on our Nation's courts, and I believe that Ms. Calvert will bring a valuable perspective to the bench, including an appreciation for the real world impact of judicial decisionmaking.

We also will be considering the nomination of Julie Rubin, who has been selected to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland.

For the past 8 years, she has served as an associate judge on the Circuit Court for Baltimore City. In this role, Judge Rubin has presided over nearly 950 civil and criminal cases that have gone to verdict or judgment, including 122 jury trials.

Prior to assuming the bench, Judge Rubin spent 15 years litigating in private practice and tried 17 cases to verdict or judgment. She also rose to become the vice president of her firm. Judge Rubin received her undergraduate degree from Mount Holyoke College and her law degree from the University of Maryland School of Law. And she received a unanimous ''Well Qualified'' rating from the American Bar Association.

Judge Rubin has the strong support of her home State Senators, Mr. CARDIN and Mr. VAN HOLLEN. She also received bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee. As a native Marylander with a wealth of trial experience on and off the bench, Judge Rubin will make an excellent addition to the District Court.

Next we have Hector Gonzalez, nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

Mr. Gonzalez is an accomplished litigator. Over the course of his career, he has tried more than 20 civil and criminal cases, the majority of them as chief counsel. Mr. Gonzalez served as a prosecutor for almost 10 years, serving in both the Manhattan District Attorney's Office as well as the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York. In addition to the criminal law expertise he developed as a prosecutor, Mr. Gonzalez has also gained considerable civil litigation experience, managing complex litigation matters involving bankruptcy, antitrust, and professional liability.

In recognition of his long career as an accomplished litigator, Mr. Gonzalez was inducted as a fellow into the American College of Trial Lawyers. The ABA found him unanimously ''Well Qualified.'' In addition, he has the strong support of Senators SCHUMER and GILLIBRAND.

Next we have John Chun, who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington.

Judge Chun has served on Washington State courts for the past 7 years, first as a judge on the King County Superior Court and currently as a judge on the Washington Court of Appeals. Throughout his time on the bench, he has presided over 90 civil and criminal cases that have gone to verdict or judgment. These cases have been almost evenly split between jury and bench trials.

Prior to his judicial appointment, Judge Chun spent 10 years as a commercial and employment litigation attorney. Practicing in both Federal and State court, he tried five cases to verdict or judgment and became partner at his firm in just 6 years. Judge Chun received his undergraduate degree from Columbia University and his law degree from Cornell Law School. He then began his legal career by clerking for the Honorable Eugene A. Wright on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Judge Chun has the strong support of Senators MURRAY and CANTWELL. He received a bipartisan vote in the Senate Judiciary Committee. He also received a unanimous ''Well Qualified'' rating from the American Bar Association. Judge Chun's demonstrable commitment to justice and the rule of law will serve him well as a district court judge.

Next is Sarah Geraghty, nominated to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia.

Since 2003, Ms. Geraghty has been an attorney at the Southern Center for Human Rights, where she has advocated for the fair and equal treatment of people in the criminal legal system, regardless of their ability to afford counsel. Ms. Geraghty has approximately 20 years of litigation experience, during which time she has handled every stage of the legal process, from pretrial investigations to briefing and arguing appeals.

Ms. Geraghty has been widely recognized for her work. In 2020, she was named Attorney of the Year by Georgia's primary legal publication, the Fulton County ''Daily Report''. In 2017, Emory University School of Law's public interest committee gave Ms. Geraghty its Unsung Devotion to Those Most in Need Award. Ms. Geraghty was rated ''Qualified'' by the American Bar Association, and both Senator OSSOFF and Senator WARNOCK strongly support her nomination.

In addition to her legal practice, Ms. Geraghty is a lecturer at Emory Law School and a part-time instructor at Georgia State University College of Law. Ms. Geraghty has received numerous letters of support, including from law enforcement officials and attorneys who have opposed her in litigation. These letters demonstrate that Ms. Geraghty's approach to resolving legal disputes has always been, as one letter put it,''collaborative rather than confrontational.'' Another letter stated that she has always ''approached conflicts between the parties with flexibility and an open mind.'' These qualities will serve her well on the bench. Ms. Geraghty received bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of her nomination.

We will also consider Georgette Castner, who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey.

She is an experienced litigator with a deep knowledge of the District of New Jersey. A graduate of the College of New Jersey and Rutgers Law School, Ms. Castner has spent almost 15 years in private practice, representing a range of individual and corporate clients. Over the course of her career, she has litigated matters spanning various areas of civil and criminal law.

Ms. Castner received a ''Qualified'' rating from the ABA and has the strong support of her home-State Senators, Mr. BOOKER and Mr. MENENDEZ.

Next is Judge Cristina Silva, nominated to the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

Judge Silva currently serves on Nevada's Eighth Judicial District Court, where she handles a mix of civil and criminal proceedings. In her time on the bench, Judge Silva has presided over 15 trials, the vast majority of which were jury trials. She has also remained active in the local legal community, including through service on the board of directors of the Nevada Latino Bar Association.

Before her appointment to the bench, Judge Silva served as both a local and Federal prosecutor. She helped lead the domestic violence unit of the Miami-

Dade State's Attorney's Office and then served for nearly a decade as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in the District of Nevada, ultimately becoming the chief of that office's criminal division. Judge Silva received a unanimous rating of ''Well Qualified'' from the ABA and has the strong support of Senators CORTEZ MASTO and ROSEN.

We also will be considering the nomination of Anne Traum, who has likewise been chosen to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

Professor Traum is currently a professor of Law at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, William S. Boyd School of Law, a position she has held since 2014, and associate dean for experiential legal education. Her commitment to the university is admirable: She founded, and now leads, the appellate clinic, which allows students to brief and argue cases before the Ninth Circuit or the Nevada Supreme Court.

Additionally, she took 1-year leave of absence from the university from 2015 to 2016 to serve as special counsel with the U.S. Department of Justice's Office for Access to Justice. The breadth of her career does not stop there, though. She was an assistant federal public defender in the Federal public defender's office in Las Vegas from 2002 to 2008 and, prior to that, served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in the Civil Division of the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Nevada from 2000 to 2002.

Professor Traum has the strong support of her home-State Senators, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO and Ms. ROSEN, and was rated ''Well Qualified'' by the American Bar Association.

Finally, we will be considering Judge Alison Nathan, who has been nominated to serve on the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

Judge Nathan is an experienced litigator and an accomplished jurist. She has served on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York since 2012. While on the bench, she has authored over 1,500 opinions and has presided over 45 trials that have gone to verdict or judgment. With that long record, her reversal rate is an impressive 1 percent. I have no doubt that she will be a valuable addition to the Second Circuit. After attending Cornell University and Cornell Law School, Judge Nathan clerked for Judge Betty B. Fletcher on the Ninth Circuit and for Justice John Paul Stevens of the U.S. Supreme Court. From there, she began her legal practice, where she specialized in civil litigation and developed a large pro bono practice focused on LGBTQ rights and appeals for inmates on death row. She also held positions in government and academia.

Judge Nathan has the strong support of Senator SCHUMER and Senator GILLIBRAND, and she was unanimously rated ''Well Qualified'' by the American Bar Association. Her record on the bench is deeply impressive. She has proven, without a doubt, that she understands the difference between a policy advocate and a judge, and I am certain that she will continue to administer justice in a thoughtful, evenhanded manner.

I support all of these outstanding nominees and encourage my colleagues to join me in voting for their confirmation.

TRIBUTE TO RAY DRAKE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank Raymond ''Ray'' Drake for his extraordinary service to the United Parcel Service, UPS. Earlier this year, Ray announced that after 46 years at the UPS, including 11 years as vice president of UPS State Public Affairs, he will be retiring this April.

Ray has a profound record of service to UPS, rising through the ranks and serving with a deep sense of loyalty and respect. In 1976, Ray was first hired at UPS as a package handler while attending the College of New Jersey. While balancing his studies, Ray was promoted to part-time hub supervisor. Upon graduating with a degree in political science, he moved to the metro New York district to become a package car driver.

Just 2 years after his graduation from college, Ray was promoted to a full-time management position, joining engineering and operations, where he spent 35 years of his career. Working in engineering and operations, Ray took on a number of assignments, holding positions in three UPS districts and numerous package and air divisions. In these roles, Ray utilized his strong leadership, technical, and analytical skills to develop and deploy operational practices throughout UPS. For the last 11 years, Ray brought his talents in leadership and advocacy to the UPS's State public affairs team, where he worked tirelessly with key policymakers in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

In Illinois, Ray has served far beyond his responsibilities with the UPS. Ray was deeply involved with the State chambers of commerce and is the former commerce chairman, the only UPS manager to chair a State chamber. Ray currently serves on several boards and committees, including the Illinois Chamber Foundation Board, the Chicagoland Chamber Board of Directors, the Chicagoland Chamber's Public Policy Committee, and the Board of Directors of Illinois' Civic Federation. In support of UPS's international initiatives, Ray serves on the Illinois advisory council for the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition and the advisory council for North Rhein Westphalia-Invest, and previously served as vice chairman of the Illinois International Business Council, an organization he helped found. In this role, Ray has used his decades of experience in transportation and operational leadership to educate and engage community leaders on investments in development and diplomacy and has used these relationships to help strengthen Illinois' economy.

In the true spirit of his own legacy at UPS, Ray was a leader in developing the wildly successful Chicagoland Regional Education Programs, which has allowed thousands of young Illinois residents the opportunity to go to college while working at UPS.

I want to close by congratulating Ray Drake on his distinguished career with the UPS and thank him for all he has done and all he will continue to do to serve communities in Illinois and across the world. Chicago is grateful for all of his service and sacrifice. Now, as he enters the next chapter in his life, I want to wish Ray and his family the very best in a long and happy retirement.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 22–10, concerning the Missile Defense Agency's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the United Kingdom for defense articles and services estimated to cost $700 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

JEDIDIAH P. ROYAL,
(For James A. Hursch, Director.)

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22–10

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of the United Kingdom.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* $400 million.
Other $300 million.
Total $700 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One (1) Ballistic Missile Defense Radar (BMDR).

Two (2) Command and Control Battle Management and Communications.

(C2BMC) User Nodes (with network capability required to connect to the C2BMC System to support radar operations).

Non-MOE: Also included are design and construction of a combined radar-equipment shelter; encryption devices, secure communication equipment, and other required COMSEC equipment to support radar operations; spare and repair parts, support and testing equipment, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Missile Defense Agency (UK–1–ZAB).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: UK–1–ZAA.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 17, 2022.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

United Kingdom—Ballistic Missile Defense Radar (BMDR) and Command and Control Battle Management and Communications (C2BMC)

The Government of the United Kingdom (UK) has requested to buy one (1) Ballistic Missile Defense Radar (BMDR); and two (2) Command and Control Battle Management and Communications (C2BMC) user nodes (with network capability required to connect to the C2BMC System to support radar operations). Also included are design and construction of a combined radar-equipment shelter; encryption devices, secure communication equipment, and other required COMSEC equipment to support radar operations; spare and repair parts, support and testing equipment, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is $700 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a NATO Ally that is a force for political stability and economic progress in Europe.

The proposed sale will improve UK's ability to meet current and future ballistic missile threats to the UK and NATO by improving the effectiveness of NATO BMD systems. The United Kingdom will have no difficulty absorbing the BMD Radar into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin, Moorestown, NJ. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale may require the assignment of approximately 15 U.S. Government and up to 100 contractor representatives to the UK, at any given time, during the construction, installation, integration and testing of the BMDR and C2BMC capability.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22–10

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The United Kingdom (UK) Ballistic Missile Defense Radar (BMDR) is a scaled version of the U.S. Long Range Discrimination Radar. It will provide continuous and precise tracking and discrimination of missile threats, persistent long-range midcourse discrimination, precision tracking and hit assessment. Discrimination is a critical capability of missile defense, which will provide data to distinguish lethal objects from debris and decoys around the lethal object. The UK will use the Command and Control, Battle Management, and Communications (C2BMC) system to integrate the UK BMDR. This will improve the effectiveness of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) missile defenses.

2. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems, which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that the United Kingdom can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of the United Kingdom.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, on March 14, 2022, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote No. 79, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 726, the nomination of Shalanda D. Young of Louisiana, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget. I was on a bipartisan congressional delegation visit to Poland, meeting with refugees displaced by the violence caused by the current, illegal invasion of Ukraine.

Had I been present, I would have voted yes to proceed with her nomination as Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

TRIBUTE TO DAN CNOSSEN

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a truly incredible and historic individual.

Dan Cnossen is a textbook definition of honor and bravery. His story began when he was accepted into the U.S. Naval Academy after high school. In 2003, he completed the grueling process. Over the course of the next 6 years, Dan was deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan where he rose in rank to becoming the officer in charge of an 18-man SEAL platoon. In 2009, late on a night mission in the mountains, Dan stepped on an improvised explosive device and lost both of his legs. Later, he was awarded a Purple Heart and a Bronze Star with Valor. Over the next 2 years, Dan fought for his life. He endured 40 different surgeries, while simultaneously reintroducing himself into civilian life—neither an easy task on their own, but coupled together creates one extraordinary obstacle.

While Dan was in rehab, though, he was introduced to the sport of cross-country skiing and biathlon. Dan pushed himself and was dedicated to earning a spot in the 2014 U.S. Paralympic Team, leading to an incredible—and ongoing—career. In 2018, Dan outstandingly won a gold medal, four silvers, and one bronze. In addition to his 2018 medals, he also earned the honor of Best Male Athlete of the Games. Most recently, at the 2022 Winter Paralympic Games, Dan made his country proud once again by winning gold in Cross Country Skiing Mixed Relay.

I think his motto ''keep going, keep covering ground'' beautifully sums up his journey so far and should serve as an inspiration for those who get to hear his story. His Paralympic career has been remarkable to see, and it is with great pride that I get to share Kansas as a home to such an outstanding individual and athlete. I ask my colleagues now to join me in recognizing Dan and his unbelievable story.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING SEASONAL SHOPPE

• Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Kentucky small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize the small business, Seasonal Shoppe of Salyersville, KY, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Bekah Frazier Rudd, owner of Seasonal Shoppe, will tell you herself that retail runs in her blood. Bekah inherited her knack for running a business from her mother and father, who owned Frazier's Prater Drug Store, the longest continuously operating business in Salyersville. Bekah's mother, Patricia Frazier, started off with a little corner in her husband's store selling arts and crafts items. Throughout the years in the drug store, the popularity of Patricia's corner eventually led her to start a business of her own, just a few doors down from her husband's pharmacy. Thus, Seasonal Shoppe was born and has been operating since 1997. Eight years later, when Patricia left to take over Frazier's Prater Drug Store, Bekah stepped in to fill her mother's shoes as owner and operator of Seasonal Shoppe.

Though Seasonal Shoppe has since shifted towards selling more clothes and general home goods than arts and

crafts, little else about the store or its quality of service has changed. Bekah continues the same friendly atmosphere created by her mother, by bringing her family around to lend a hand in the store. Bekah works alongside her sister-in-law, as well two full-time staff and two local high school students who work part-time for Seasonal Shoppe. And just how Bekah used to work inside her father's drug store, her two children are common faces at Seasonal Shoppe, helping out with merchandise sales and with seasonal events.

Bekah not only perpetuates the same family-friendly atmosphere created by her mother, she pays mind to the traditions passed down to her by her father. Mr. Frazier always said that it was their duty as Main Street mainstays to support the community. Bekah continues this tradition by sponsoring the local high school sports teams, community churches, and most recently helping out the local fire department with their annual fundraiser. This charitable spirit instilled in her by her parents comes in addition to the good business sense she inherited from them, and it is this special combination of devotion to the community and to the livelihood of the store that has kept Seasonal Shoppe running these past 25 years.

Small businesses like Seasonal Shoppe are the lifeblood of small towns across Kentucky, and they serve as an inspiring example of how the entrepreneurial spirit transcends multiple generations. Moreover, the story of Seasonal Shoppe illustrates that sometimes it takes an existing business to start a new business, in that Patricia reached her customer base through her husband's drug store. Seasonal Shoppe and their role in the Salyersville community demonstrates how small businesses are an integral part of the daily life of small towns across the country, and I am thankful for the chance to honor these entrepreneurs and what they represent.

Congratulations to Bekah and the entire Seasonal Shoppe team. I wish them the best of luck and look forward to watching their continued growth and success in Kentucky.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:18 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3197. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the City of Eunice, Louisiana, certain Federal land in Louisiana, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4380. An act to designate the El Paso Community Healing Garden National Memorial, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6434. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish, within the National Park Service, the Japanese American World War II History Network, and for other purposes.

At 3:46 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7108. An act to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4380. An act to designate the El Paso Community Healing Garden National Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 6434. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish, within the National Park Service, the Japanese American World War II History Network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3197. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the City of Eunice, Louisiana, certain Federal land in Louisiana, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–3439. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of Executive Order on Access to Affordable Life-Saving Medications'' (RIN0906–AB25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 9, 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3440. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tobacco Products; Required Warnings for Cigarette Packages and Advertisements; Delay of Effective Date'' (RIN0910–AI39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3441. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2022–05, Introduction'' (FAC 2022–05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 9, 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3442. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bureau's fiscal year 2021 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3443. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2021 through September 30, 2021 and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3444. A communication from the Associate Administrator for Policy, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Parts and Accessories Necessary for Safe Operation; Authorized Windshield Area for the Installation of Vehicle Safety Technology'' (RIN2126–AC42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3445. A communication from the Associate Administrator for Policy, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Record of Violations'' (RIN2126–AC15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3446. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Improving Competitive Broadband Acces to Multiple Tenant Environments'' ((GN Docket No. 17–142) (FCC 22–12)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3447. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Television Broadcasting Services; Toledo, Ohio'' (MB Docket No. 21–73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3448. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order declaring additional steps to be taken concerning the national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States posed by specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation declared in Executive Order 14024 of April 15, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3449. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Child Welfare Outcomes 2019''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3450. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''March 2022 Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3451. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Immigrant Juvenile Petitions'' (RIN1615–AB81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2022; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–116. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska applying to the United States Congress, pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution, to call a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the United States Constitution that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION NO. 14

Now, Therefore, be it Resolved by the Members of the One Hundred Seventh Legislature of Nebraska, Second Session:

1. The Legislature of the State of Nebraska hereby applies to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the constitution of the United States that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress.

2. The Clerk of the Legislature shall transmit copies of this application to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to the members of the Senate and House of Representatives from this state, and to the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses in the several states, requesting their cooperation.

3. This application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the several states have made applications on the same subject.

4. This application will be rescinded as of February 1, 2027.

POM–117. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, urging the New York State Legislature and the United States Congress to pass legislation that will address the negative impact that ''flushable'' wipes have on Rockland County Sewer District No. 1 and other Sewer Treatment Plant Operators in New York State are facing; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM–118. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to opposing legislation granting amnesty to persons entering the United States in violation of the laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–119. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to enactment of federal legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 3859. A bill to control the export of electronic waste in order to ensure that such waste does not become the source of counterfeit goods that may reenter military and civilian electronics supply chains in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 3860. A bill to establish a grant program to provide assistance to local governments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 3861. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit annual reports to Congress on the assistance provided to Somaliland and to conduct a feasibility study, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense , on establishing a security partnership with Somaliland, without recognizing Somaliland as an independent state; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 3862. A bill to authorize the Department of Education in coordination with other relevant Federal agencies, to include a longitudinal component on the impact of the COVID–19 pandemic on student outcomes and well-being on an existing longitudinal educational study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 3863. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to obtain an independent cybersecurity assessment of information systems of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 3864. A bill to improve the pediatric mental health care access grant program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 3865. A bill to require disclosure of the total amount of interest that would be paid over the life of a loan for certain Federal students loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3866. A bill to establish Ocean Innovation Clusters to strengthen the coastal communities and ocean economy of the United States through technological research and development, job training, and cross-sector partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. WARNER, Mr. TESTER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3867. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the use of cryptocurrency to facilitate transactions by Russian persons subject to sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 3868. A bill to correct the inequitable denial of enhanced retirement and annuity benefits to certain U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 3869. A bill to add Ireland to the E–3 nonimmigrant visa program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 3870. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters within the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 3871. A bill to provide a means for Congress to prevent an organization's designation as a foreign terrorist organization from being revoked by the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 3872. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Special Inspector General for Pandemic Recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 3873. A bill to designate the outdoor amphitheater at the Blue Ridge Music Center in Galax, Virginia, as the ''Rock Boucher Amphitheater''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. KELLY):

S. 3874. A bill to amend section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to ensure appropriate compensation for certain hours of overtime work by border patrol agents; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3875. A bill to require the President to develop and maintain products that show the risk of natural hazards across the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 3876. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize of the Secretary of the Treasury to place prohibitions or conditions on certain transmittals of funds in connection with jurisdictions, financial institutions, international transactions, or types of accounts of primary money laundering concern; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 3877. A bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to Chinese financial institutions that clear, verify, or settle transactions with Russian or Russian-controlled financial institutions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 3878. A bill to require the establishment of defender organizations by Federal judicial districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 3879. A bill to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to promulgate regulations on regional and interregional transmission planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 3880. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to define and provide for accommodation and designation of technical measures to identify, protect, or manage copyrighted works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

S. 3881. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out teacher leadership programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 3882. A bill to require the End-User Review Committee to conduct quarterly reviews with respect to the inclusion of certain Russian energy entities on the Entity List; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. Res. 550. A resolution recognizing the value of the Older Americans Act Nutrition Program in addressing hunger, malnutrition, food insecurity, and social or geographic isolation and improving the health and quality of life for millions of older individuals in the United States each year; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 551. A resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers to the lives of the people of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KELLY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. Res. 552. A resolution designating March 2022 as ''Irish-American Heritage Month'' and honoring the significance of Irish-Americans in the history and progress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGERTY:

S. Res. 553. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that, since January 20, 2021, President Biden has implemented policies impeding domestic energy production and gas prices have steadily increased; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 79

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 79, a bill to eliminate the disparity in sentencing for cocaine offenses, and for other purposes.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 642

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to protect the rights of passengers with disabilities in air transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 1079

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1079, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the troops from the United States and the Philippines who defended Bataan and Corregidor, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service during World War II.

S. 1089

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to direct the Government Accountability Office to evaluate appropriate coverage of assistive technologies provided to patients who experience amputation or live with limb difference.

S. 1233

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1233, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify reporting requirements, promote tax compliance, and reduce tip reporting compliance burdens in the beauty service industry.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer and for other purposes.

S. 1489

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1489, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to establish an Inspector General of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and for other purposes.

S. 1888

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1888, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 2565

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2565, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for the testing of a community-based palliative care model.

S. 2677

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2677, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to limit overdraft fees and establish fair and transparent practices related to the marketing and provision of overdraft coverage programs at depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2706

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2706, a bill to improve diversity in clinical trials and data collection for COVID–19 and future public health threats to address social determinants of health.

S. 2743

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2743, a bill to make companies that support venues and events eligible for grants under the shuttered venue operators grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2956

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2956, a bill to advance targeted, high-impact, and evidence-based inventions for the prevention and treatment of global malnutrition, to improve the coordination of such programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3325

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3325, a bill to make companies that support venues and events eligible for grants under the shuttered venue operators grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 3421

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3421, a bill to clarify that section 107 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act applies sanctions with respect to unmanned combat aerial vehicles following a 2019 change by the United Nations providing additional clarity to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

S. 3569

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Michigan

(Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3569, a bill to extend the program to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at certain health centers.

S. 3700

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3700, a bill to provide for appropriate cost-sharing for insulin products covered under Medicare part D and private health plans.

S. 3802

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3802, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a windfall profits excise tax on crude oil and to rebate the tax collected back to individual taxpayers, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 41

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 41, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Health and Human Services relating to ''Ensuring Access to Equitable, Affordable, Client-Centered, Quality Family Planning Services''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 3869. A bill to add Ireland to the E–3 nonimmigrant visa program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3869

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. E–3 VISAS FOR IRISH NATIONALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(a)(15)(E)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(E)(iii)) is amended by inserting ''or, on a basis of reciprocity as determined by the Secretary of State, a national of Ireland,'' after ''Australia''.

(b) EMPLOYER REQUIREMENTS.—Section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (t) (as added by section 1(b)(2)(B) of Public Law 108–449 (118 Stat. 3470)) as subsection (u); and

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (t)(1) (as added by section 402(b)(2) of Public Law 108–77 (117 Stat. 941)) the following:

''(E) In the case of an attestation filed with respect to a national of Ireland described in section 101(a)(15)(E)(iii), the employer is, and will remain during the period of authorized employment of such Irish national, a participant in good standing in the E-Verify program described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note).''.

(c) APPLICATION ALLOCATION.—Paragraph (11) of section 214(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)(11)) is amended to read as follows:

''(11)(A) The Secretary of State may approve initial applications submitted for aliens described in section 101(a)(15)(E)(iii) only as follows:

''(i) For applicants who are nationals of the Commonwealth of Australia, not more than 10,500 for a fiscal year.

''(ii) For applicants who are nationals of Ireland, not more than a number equal to the difference between 10,500 and the number of applications approved in the prior fiscal year for aliens who are nationals of the Commonwealth of Australia.

''(B) The approval of an application described under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be deemed for numerical control purposes to have occurred on September 30 of the prior fiscal year.

''(C) The numerical limitation under subparagraph (A) shall only apply to principal aliens and not to the spouses or children of such aliens.''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 550—RECOGNIZING THE VALUE OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT NUTRITION PROGRAM IN ADDRESSING HUNGER, MALNUTRITION, FOOD INSECURITY, AND SOCIAL OR GEOGRAPHIC ISOLATION AND IMPROVING THE HEALTH AND QUALITY OF LIFE FOR MILLIONS OF OLDER INDIVIDUALS IN THE UNITED STATES EACH YEAR

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 550

Whereas thousands of local nutrition programs supported by part C of title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030d–21 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as the ''OAA Nutrition Program''), both congregate and home-delivered programs, provide a vital lifeline to millions of individuals 60 years of age or older in communities across the United States who may be homebound and socially or geographically isolated, and struggling with hunger, food insecurity, or malnutrition;

Whereas local nutrition programs supported by the OAA Nutrition Program provide nutritious meals, socialization, friendly visits, and wellness and safety checks through volunteers and staff to individuals who may suffer from long-term chronic conditions, as well as to those who live in the community and have the greatest social or economic need;

Whereas the official purposes of the OAA Nutrition Program are to reduce hunger, food insecurity, and malnutrition, to promote socialization of older individuals, and to promote the health and well-being of older individuals by assisting such individuals in gaining access to nutrition and other disease prevention and health promotion services in order to delay the onset of adverse health conditions resulting from poor nutritional health or sedentary behavior;

Whereas the OAA Nutrition Program saves significant taxpayer dollars and reduces health care expenditures, often paid through Medicare or Medicaid, by helping to reduce falls, avoid unnecessary trips, admissions, and readmissions to the hospital, expedite recovery from illness, and enable older individuals to live independently for longer;

Whereas local nutrition programs supported by the OAA Nutrition Program are proven, valuable, and effective public-private partnerships that benefit from non-Federal private, corporate, and individual funding and donations to operate their services efficiently and effectively;

Whereas the population of individuals in the United States who are 60 years of age or older is rapidly growing and projected to increase dramatically each year over the next several decades;

Whereas, on March 22, 1972, President Richard Nixon signed into law Public Law 92–258, which amended the Older Americans Act of 1965 and established a national nutrition program for individuals 60 years of age or older; and

Whereas this 50th anniversary of the OAA Nutrition Program provides an opportunity to celebrate and honor community-based organizations that deliver vital and critical services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and values the important work of local nutrition programs supported by part C of title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030d–21 et seq.) (referred to in this resolution as the ''OAA Nutrition Program'') nationwide in giving voice to and addressing senior hunger, malnutrition, and isolation, and improving the quality of life of millions of older individuals in the United States each year;

(2) recognizes and values the important role that local nutrition programs supported by the OAA Nutrition Program and national organizations play in increasing awareness of the growing unmet need for these programs and in raising additional non-Federal funds and soliciting volunteers to support and assist these programs' important missions;

(3) recognizes and values volunteers as the backbone of the OAA Nutrition Program, noting that they deliver nutritious meals to older individuals who are at significant risk of hunger, malnutrition, and isolation, and provide caring concern and attention to the welfare of program participants; and

(4) encourages members of Congress to support their local nutrition programs supported by the OAA Nutrition Program by participating in 50th anniversary events, delivering meals to homebound older individuals or serving them in a congregate setting with a program in their district or State, and working to ensure sustained Federal funding for the OAA Nutrition Program.

SENATE RESOLUTION 551—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI AND AMERICORPS SENIORS VOLUNTEERS TO THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN,

and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 551

Whereas, since their inceptions, each of the AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors national service programs have proven to be a highly effective way—

(1) to engage the people of the United States in meeting a wide range of local and national needs; and

(2) to promote the ethics of service and volunteerism;

Whereas, each year, more than 250,000 individuals serve in AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors at more than 40,000 locations across the United States to give back in an intensive way to communities, States, Tribal nations, and the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors funds have been invested in nonprofit, community, educational, and faith-based groups, and those funds leverage hundreds of millions of dollars in outside funding and in-kind donations each year;

Whereas AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers have provided millions of hours of service nationwide, helping—

(1) to improve the lives of the most vulnerable people of the United States;

(2) to protect the environment;

(3) to contribute to public safety;

(4) to respond to disasters and public health emergencies;

(5) to strengthen the educational system of the United States; and

(6) to expand economic opportunity;

Whereas AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers recruit and supervise millions of community volunteers, demonstrating the value of AmeriCorps as a powerful force for encouraging people to become involved in volunteering and community service;

Whereas, for more than 5 decades, millions of AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers in the RSVP, Foster Grandparent, and Senior Companion programs have played an important role in strengthening communities by sharing their experience, knowledge, and accomplishments with the individuals they serve;

Whereas, since 1994, more than 1,200,000 individuals have taken the AmeriCorps pledge to ''get things done for America'' by becoming AmeriCorps members through the AmeriCorps State and National, AmeriCorps VISTA, and AmeriCorps NCCC programs;

Whereas AmeriCorps members nationwide, in return for the service of those members, have earned more than $4,000,000,000 to use to further their own educational advancement at colleges and universities across the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps is a proven pathway to employment, providing members with valuable career skills, experience, and contacts to prepare them for the 21st century workforce;

Whereas, in 2009, Congress passed the bipartisan Serve America Act (Public Law 111–13; 123 Stat. 1460), which authorized the expansion of national service, expanded opportunities to serve, increased efficiency and accountability, and strengthened the capacity of organizations and communities to solve problems;

Whereas national service programs have engaged millions of people in the United States in results-driven service in the most vulnerable communities of the United States, providing hope and help to individuals with economic and social needs;

Whereas national service and volunteerism demonstrate the best of the spirit of the United States, bringing people together to address the most pressing challenges in their communities; and

Whereas AmeriCorps Week, observed in 2022 from March 13 through March 19, is an appropriate time for the people of the United States—

(1) to salute current and former AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers for their positive impact on the lives of people in the United States;

(2) to thank the community partners of AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors for making the programs possible; and

(3) to encourage more people in the United States to become involved in service and volunteering: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) encourages the people of the United States to join in a national effort—

(A) to salute AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers; and

(B) to raise awareness about the importance of national and community service;

(2) acknowledges the significant accomplishments of the volunteers, members, alumni, and community partners of AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors;

(3) recognizes the important contributions made by AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers to the lives of the people of the United States; and

(4) encourages individuals of all ages to consider opportunities to serve in AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors.

SENATE RESOLUTION 552—DESIGNATING MARCH 2022 AS ''IRISH-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH'' AND HONORING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF IRISH-AMERICANS IN THE HISTORY AND PROGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KELLY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 552

Whereas, from the earliest days of the United States, the United States has inspired the hopes and dreams of countless individuals from around the world in search of a better life for themselves and their children;

Whereas more than 31,500,000 United States citizens trace their ancestry to Ireland;

Whereas, since before the United States was founded, Irish men and women undertook the perilous journey across the Atlantic Ocean to make a home in the United States, a place of hope and promise, and made inestimable contributions to the United States, both during the struggle for independence and after the founding of the republic;

Whereas 9 of the 56 signatories of the Declaration of Independence, 4 associate justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and 22 Presidents proudly claim Irish heritage.

Whereas Irish immigrants who came to the United States during the Great Famine of the 1840s helped transform cities in the United States, building them into dynamic centers of commerce and industry;

Whereas the cultural, economic, and spiritual contributions of Irish immigrants continue to be evident today throughout the United States;

Whereas Irish Americans have become deeply integrated into communities with strength, courage, wit, and creativity, making significant contributions in all areas of life;

Whereas Irish-American writers such as Eugene O'Neill, John O'Hara, and F. Scott Fitzgerald transformed literature in the United States, entrepreneurs like Chuck Feeney helped revolutionize industry and philanthropy in the United States, performers such as Gregory Peck, Lucille Ball, and Gene Kelly enriched the arts, and social reformers such as suffragist Leonora Barry and labor organizer Mary Kenney O'Sullivan fought for the rights of others;

Whereas Irish-Americans have served ably in communities in numerous capacities, including in public safety and government at the Federal, State, and local level, and in the Armed Forces in every war in which the United States has fought since the Revolutionary War, including patriots such as Audie Murphy, the most decorated soldier of World War II;

Whereas, more than 200 years ago, John Barry, who was born in Ireland, was the first naval hero of the Revolutionary War and became known as the Father of the Navy;

Whereas the United States played a prominent role in support of negotiations of the Good Friday Agreement (also known as the Belfast Agreement), done at Belfast, April 10, 1998, and has taken a leading role in promoting peace on the island of Ireland more broadly;

Whereas Congress greatly values the close relationships the United States shares with both the United Kingdom and Ireland and is steadfastly committed to supporting the peaceful resolution of any and all political challenges in Northern Ireland; and

Whereas, on February 28, 2022, President Joseph R. Biden, Jr., proclaimed March 2022 as Irish-American Heritage Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 2022 as ''Irish-American Heritage Month'';

(2) recognizes the significant contributions of Irish-Americans in the history and progress of United States; and

(3) supports the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement (also known as the Belfast Agreement) and subsequent agreements or arrangements for implementation of that Agreement to support peace on the island of Ireland.

SENATE RESOLUTION 553—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT, SINCE JANUARY 20, 2021, PRESIDENT BIDEN HAS IMPLEMENTED POLICIES IMPEDING DOMESTIC ENERGY PRODUCTION AND GAS PRICES HAVE STEADILY INCREASED

Mr. HAGERTY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 553

Whereas, on Election Day 2020, the average price of gas in the United States was $2.11 per gallon;

Whereas, on January 20, 2021, the inauguration day of President Joseph R. Biden, Jr., while the average gas price was $2.38 per gallon, President Biden—

(1) through Executive Order 13990 (86 Fed. Reg. 7037; relating to public health and the environment)—

(A) revoked the Keystone XL pipeline permit;

(B) paused oil-and-gas leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and

(C) placed new regulations on oil-and-gas production in the United States, including directing agencies to assess a ''social cost

of carbon'' on producers in the United States;

(2) rejoined the Paris Climate Agreement, a landmark international fossil-fuel suppression mandate; and

(3) through Executive Order 13992 (86 Fed. Reg. 7049; relating to federal regulation), repealed several executive orders issued by President Donald J. Trump that reduced Federal regulation and increased regulatory transparency, in order to facilitate ''robust regulatory action'' to address climate change;

Whereas, during President Biden's second week in office, President Biden issued Executive Order 14008 (86 Fed. Reg. 7619; relating to climate change), which stopped new oil and natural gas leases on public lands and offshore waters, where approximately a quarter of United States oil-and-gas production occurs;

Whereas, in the first week of May 2021, President Biden issued Executive Order 14027 (86 Fed. Reg. 25947; relating to establishment of the Climate Change Support Office), which established the Climate Change Support Office to support efforts by the Biden Administration ''to elevate and underscore the commitment the Administration will make towards addressing the global climate crisis'';

Whereas, by mid-May 2021, the average price of gas had climbed to $3.02 per gallon, at which point President Biden signed Executive Order 14030 (86 Fed. Reg. 27967; relating to climate-related financial risk), which directed financial regulators to take actions to discourage financing of United States oil-and-gas production in order to ''mitigate climate-related financial risk'';

Whereas, by early September 2021, the average price of gas rose to $3.17 per gallon after President Biden signed Executive Order 14037 (86 Fed. Reg. 43583; relating to clean cars and trucks), which requires at least 50 percent of new sales of passenger cars and light-duty trucks in the United States to be zero-emission vehicles by 2030;

Whereas, by early January 2022—

(1) the Environmental Protection Agency had proposed a denial of all pending exemptions to small refineries for compliance years 2019 through 2021 and the reversal of the decision to grant exemptions for the 2018 compliance year, meaning that small refineries, which are normally exempt from annual renewable fuel standard (RFS) obligations, will owe 5 years' worth of RFS compliance costs in a single calendar year;

(2) President Biden signed Executive Order 14057 (86 Fed. Reg. 70935; relating to clean energy industries and jobs), which called for the Federal Government to achieve a carbon-free electricity sector by 2035 and net-zero emissions economy-wide by 2050; and

(3) the average price of gas was $3.28 per gallon; and

Whereas, 2 days before the Russian Federation invaded Ukraine and nearly a week before President Biden banned oil and energy imports from the Russian Federation, the average price of gas was $3.61 per gallon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that President Joseph R. Biden, Jr., has implemented policies impeding domestic energy production and gas prices have steadily increased throughout his presidency.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5001. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 120, to prevent and respond to the misuse of communications services that facilitates domestic violence and other crimes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5001. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 120, to prevent and respond to the misuse of communications services that facilitates domestic violence and other crimes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Safe Connections Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, terms used in this Act that are defined in section 345(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, have the meanings given those terms in such section 345(a).

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual assault, human trafficking, and related crimes are life-threatening issues and have lasting and harmful effects on individuals, families, and entire communities.

(2) Survivors often lack meaningful support and options when establishing independence from an abuser, including barriers such as financial insecurity and limited access to reliable communications tools to maintain essential connections with family, social safety networks, employers, and support services.

(3) Perpetrators of violence and abuse described in paragraph (1) increasingly use technological and communications tools to exercise control over, monitor, and abuse their victims.

(4) Communications law can play a public interest role in the promotion of safety, life, and property with respect to the types of violence and abuse described in paragraph (1). For example, independent access to a wireless phone plan can assist survivors in establishing security and autonomy.

(5) Safeguards within communications services can serve a role in preventing abuse and narrowing the digital divide experienced by survivors of abuse.

SEC. 4. PROTECTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SURVIVORS WITHIN COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.

Part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 345. PROTECTION OF SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, HUMAN TRAFFICKING, AND RELATED CRIMES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ABUSER.—The term 'abuser' means an individual who has committed or allegedly committed a covered act against—

''(A) an individual who seeks relief under subsection (b); or

''(B) an individual in the care of an individual who seeks relief under subsection (b).

''(2) COVERED ACT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered act' means conduct that constitutes—

''(i) a crime described in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(a)), including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking;

''(ii) an act or practice described in paragraph (11) or (12) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102) (relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons and sex trafficking, respectively); or

''(iii) an act under State law, Tribal law, or the Uniform Code of Military Justice that is similar to an offense described in clause (i) or (ii).

''(B) CONVICTION NOT REQUIRED.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to require a criminal conviction or any other determination of a court in order for conduct to constitute a covered act.

''(3) COVERED PROVIDER.—The term 'covered provider' means a provider of a private mobile service or commercial mobile service, as those terms are defined in section 332(d).

''(4) PRIMARY ACCOUNT HOLDER.—The term 'primary account holder' means an individual who is a party to a mobile service contract with a covered provider.

''(5) SHARED MOBILE SERVICE CONTRACT.—The term 'shared mobile service contract'—

''(A) means a mobile service contract for an account that includes not less than 2 consumers; and

''(B) does not include enterprise services offered by a covered provider.

''(6) SURVIVOR.—The term 'survivor' means an individual who is not less than 18 years old and—

''(A) against whom a covered act has been committed or allegedly committed; or

''(B) who cares for another individual against whom a covered act has been committed or allegedly committed (provided that the individual providing care did not commit or allegedly commit the covered act).

''(b) SEPARATION OF LINES FROM SHARED MOBILE SERVICE CONTRACT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 business days after receiving a completed line separation request from a survivor pursuant to subsection (c), a covered provider shall, as applicable, with respect to a shared mobile service contract under which the survivor and the abuser each use a line —

''(A) separate the line of the survivor, and the line of any individual in the care of the survivor, from the shared mobile service contract; or

''(B) separate the line of the abuser from the shared mobile service contract.

''(2) LIMITATIONS ON PENALTIES, FEES, AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (5) through (8), a covered provider may not make separation of a line from a shared mobile service contract under paragraph (1) contingent on any requirement other than the requirements under subsection (c), including—

''(A) payment of a fee, penalty, or other charge;

''(B) maintaining contractual or billing responsibility of a separated line with the provider;

''(C) approval of separation by the primary account holder, if the primary account holder is not the survivor;

''(D) a prohibition or limitation, including one described in subparagraph (A), on number portability, provided such portability is technically feasible, or a request to change phone numbers;

''(E) a prohibition or limitation on the separation of lines as a result of arrears accrued by the account;

''(F) an increase in the rate charged for the mobile service plan of the primary account holder with respect to service on any remaining line or lines; or

''(G) any other limitation or requirement not listed under subsection (c).

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (2) shall be construed to require a covered provider to provide a rate plan for the primary account holder that is not otherwise commercially available.

''(4) REMOTE OPTION.—A covered provider shall offer a survivor the ability to submit a line separation request under subsection (c) through secure remote means that are easily navigable, provided that remote options are

commercially available and technically feasible.

''(5) RESPONSIBILITY FOR TRANSFERRED TELEPHONE NUMBERS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), beginning on the date on which a covered provider transfers billing responsibilities for and rights to a telephone number or numbers to a survivor under paragraph (1)(A) in response to a line separation request submitted by the survivor under subsection (c), unless ordered otherwise by a court, the survivor shall assume financial responsibility, including for monthly service costs, for the transferred telephone number or numbers.

''(6) RESPONSIBILITY FOR TRANSFERRED TELEPHONE NUMBERS FROM A SURVIVOR'S ACCOUNT.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), upon the transfer of a telephone number under paragraph (1)(B) in response to a line separation request submitted by a survivor under subsection (c), the survivor shall have no further financial responsibilities to the transferring covered provider for the services provided by the transferring covered provider for the telephone number or for any mobile device associated with the telephone number.

''(7) RESPONSIBILITY FOR MOBILE DEVICE.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), beginning on the date on which a covered provider transfers billing responsibilities for and rights to a telephone number or numbers to a survivor under paragraph (1)(A) in response to a line separation request submitted by the survivor under subsection (c), unless otherwise ordered by a court, the survivor shall not assume financial responsibility for any mobile device associated with the separated line, unless the survivor purchased the mobile device, or affirmatively elects to maintain possession of the mobile device.

''(8) NOTICE TO SURVIVOR.—If a covered provider separates a line from a shared mobile service contract under paragraph (1) and the primary account holder is not the survivor, the covered provider shall notify the survivor of the date on which the covered provider intends to give any formal notice to the primary account holder.

''(c) LINE SEPARATION REQUEST.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A survivor shall submit to the covered provider a line separation request that—

''(A) verifies that an individual who uses a line under the shared mobile service contract has committed or allegedly committed a covered act against the survivor or an individual in the survivor's care, by providing—

''(i) a copy of a signed affidavit from a licensed medical or mental health care provider, licensed military medical or mental health care provider, licensed social worker, victim services provider, or licensed military victim services provider, or an employee of a court, acting within the scope of that person's employment; or

''(ii) a copy of a police report, statements provided by police, including military police, to magistrates or judges, charging documents, protective or restraining orders, military protective orders, or any other official record that documents the covered act;

''(B) in the case of relief sought under subsection (b)(1)(A), with respect to—

''(i) a line used by the survivor that the survivor seeks to have separated, states that the survivor is the user of that specific line; and

''(ii) a line used by an individual in the care of the survivor that the survivor seeks to have separated, includes an affidavit setting forth that the individual—

''(I) is in the care of the survivor; and

''(II) is the user of that specific line; and

''(C) requests relief under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(1) and identifies each line that should be separated.

''(2) COMMUNICATIONS FROM COVERED PROVIDERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A covered provider shall notify a survivor seeking relief under subsection (b) in clear and accessible language that the covered provider may contact the survivor, or designated representative of the survivor, to confirm the line separation, or if the covered provider is unable to complete the line separation for any reason, pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C).

''(B) REMOTE MEANS.—A covered provider shall notify a survivor under subparagraph (A) through remote means, provided that remote means are commercially available and technically feasible.

''(C) ELECTION OF MANNER OF CONTACT.—When completing a line separation request submitted by a survivor through remote means under paragraph (1), a covered provider shall allow the survivor to elect in the manner in which the covered provider may—

''(i) contact the survivor, or designated representative of the survivor, in response to the request, if necessary; or

''(ii) notify the survivor, or designated representative of the survivor, of the inability of the covered provider to complete the line separation.

''(3) ENHANCED PROTECTIONS UNDER STATE LAW.—This subsection shall not affect any law or regulation of a State providing communications protections for survivors (or any similar category of individuals) that has less stringent requirements for providing evidence of a covered act (or any similar category of conduct) than this subsection.

''(d) CONFIDENTIAL AND SECURE TREATMENT OF PERSONAL INFORMATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 222(c)(2), a covered provider and any officer, director, employee, vendor, or agent thereof shall treat any information submitted by a survivor under subsection (c) as confidential and securely dispose of the information not later than 90 days after receiving the information.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to prohibit a covered provider from maintaining, for longer than the period specified in that paragraph, a record that verifies that a survivor fulfilled the conditions of a line separation request under subsection (c).

''(e) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION TO CONSUMERS.—A covered provider shall make information about the options and process described in subsections (b) and (c) readily available to consumers—

''(1) on the website and the mobile application of the provider;

''(2) in physical stores; and

''(3) in other forms of public-facing consumer communication.

''(f) TECHNICAL INFEASIBILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The requirement to effectuate a line separation request pursuant to subsection (b)(1) shall not apply to a covered provider if the covered provider cannot operationally or technically effectuate the request.

''(2) NOTIFICATION.—If a covered provider cannot operationally or technically effectuate a line separation request as described in paragraph (1), the covered provider shall—

''(A) notify the survivor who submitted the request of that infeasibility—

''(i) at the time of the request; or

''(ii) in the case of a survivor who has submitted the request using remote means, not later than 2 business days after receiving the request; and

''(B) provide the survivor with information about other alternatives to submitting a line separation request, including starting a new line of service.

''(g) LIABILITY PROTECTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered provider and any officer, director, employee, vendor, or agent thereof shall not be subject to liability for any claims deriving from an action taken or omission made with respect to compliance with this section and the rules adopted to implement this section.

''(2) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority of the Commission to enforce this section or any rules or regulations promulgated by the Commission pursuant to this section.''.

SEC. 5. RULEMAKING ON PROTECTIONS FOR SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Affordable Connectivity Program'' means the program established under section 904(b) of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260), as amended by section 60502 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117–58), or any successor program;

(2) the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(3) the term ''Commission'' means the Federal Communications Commission;

(4) the term ''covered hotline'' means a hotline related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, sex trafficking, severe forms of trafficking in persons, or any other similar act;

(5) the term ''designated program'' means the program designated by the Commission under subsection (c)(3)(A)(i) to provide emergency communications support to survivors;

(6) the term ''Lifeline program'' means the program set forth in subpart E of part 54 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation); and

(7) the term ''text message'' has the meaning given the term in section 227(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)).

(b) RULEMAKINGS.—

(1) LINE SEPARATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall adopt rules to implement section 345 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In adopting rules under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consider—

(i) privacy protections;

(ii) account security and fraud detection;

(iii) account billing procedures;

(iv) procedures for notification of survivors about line separation processes;

(v) notice to account holders;

(vi) situations in which a covered provider cannot operationally or technically separate a telephone number or numbers from a shared service plan such that the provider cannot effectuate a line separation request;

(vii) the requirements for remote submission of a line separation request, including how that option facilitates submission of verification information and meets the other requirements of section 345 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act;

(viii) feasibility of remote options for small covered providers;

(ix) implementation timelines, including those for small covered providers;

(x) financial responsibility for transferred telephone numbers;

(xi) whether and how the survivor can affirmatively elect to take financial responsibility for the mobile device associated with the separated line;

(xii) compliance with subpart U of part 64 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or

any successor regulations (relating to customer proprietary network information) or any other legal or law enforcement requirements; and

(xiii) ensuring covered providers have the necessary account information to comply with the rules and with section 345 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act.

(2) EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT FOR SURVIVORS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, or as part of a general rulemaking proceeding relating to the Lifeline program or the Affordable Connectivity Program, whichever occurs earlier, the Commission shall adopt rules that—

(i) designate a single program, which shall be either the Lifeline program or the Affordable Connectivity Program, to provide emergency communications support to survivors in accordance with this paragraph; and

(ii) allow a survivor who is suffering from financial hardship and meets the requirements under section 345(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, without regard to whether the survivor meets the otherwise applicable eligibility requirements of the designated program, to—

(I) enroll in the designated program as quickly as is feasible; and

(II) participate in the designated program based on such qualifications for not more than 6 months.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In adopting rules under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consider—

(i) how survivors who are eligible for relief and elected to separate a line under section 345(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, but whose lines could not be separated due to operational or technical infeasibility, can participate in the designated program; and

(ii) confidentiality in the transfer and retention of any necessary documentation regarding the eligibility of a survivor to enroll in the designated program.

(C) EVALUATION.—Not later than 2 years after completing the rulemaking under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall—

(i) evaluate the effectiveness of the Commission's provision of support to survivors through the designated program;

(ii) assess the detection and elimination of fraud, waste, and abuse with respect to the support described in clause (i); and

(iii) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the evaluation and assessment described in clauses (i) and (ii), respectively.

(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the ability of a survivor who meets the requirements under section 345(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, to participate in the designated program indefinitely if the survivor otherwise qualifies for the designated program under the rules of the designated program.

(E) NOTIFICATION.—A provider of wireless communications services that receives a line separation request pursuant to section 345 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, shall inform the survivor who submitted the request of—

(i) the existence of the designated program;

(ii) who qualifies to participate in the designated program under the rules adopted under subparagraph (A) that are specially applicable to survivors; and

(iii) how to participate in the designated program under the rules described in clause (ii).

(3) HOTLINE CALLS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall commence a rulemaking proceeding to consider whether to, and how the Commission should—

(i) establish, and update on a monthly basis, a central database of covered hotlines to be used by providers of wireless communications services or wireline voice services; and

(ii) require providers of wireless communications services or wireline voice services to omit from consumer-facing logs of calls or text messages any records of calls or text messages to covered hotlines in the central database described in clause (i), while maintaining internal records of those calls and messages.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—The rulemaking conducted under subparagraph (A) shall include consideration of—

(i) the ability of law enforcement agencies or survivors to access a log of calls or text messages in a criminal investigation or civil proceeding;

(ii) the ability of providers of wireless communication services or wireline voice services to—

(I) identify logs that are consumer-facing; and

(II) omit certain consumer-facing logs, while maintaining internal records of such calls and text messages; and

(iii) any other factors associated with the implementation of clauses (i) and (ii) to protect survivors of domestic violence, including factors that may impact smaller providers.

(C) NO EFFECT ON LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to—

(i) limit or otherwise affect the ability of a law enforcement agency to access a log of calls or text messages in a criminal investigation; or

(ii) alter or otherwise expand provider requirements under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (Public Law 103–414; 108 Stat. 4279) or the amendments made by that Act.

(D) COMPLIANCE.—If the Commission establishes a central database through the rulemaking under subparagraph (A) and a covered provider updates its own databases to match the central database not less frequently than once every 30 days, no cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against the covered provider or its officers, employees, or agents for claims deriving from omission from consumer-facing logs of calls or text messages any records of calls or text messages to covered hotlines in the central database.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The requirements under section 345 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, shall take effect 60 days after the date on which the Federal Communications Commission adopts the rules implementing that section pursuant to section 5(b)(2) of this Act.

SEC. 7. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to abrogate, limit, or otherwise affect the provisions set forth in the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (Public Law 103–414; 108 Stat. 4279) and the amendments made by that Act, any authority granted to the Commission pursuant to that Act or the amendments made by that Act, or any regulations promulgated by the Commission pursuant to that Act or the amendments made by that Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Ms. CORTEZ-MASTO. Mr. President, I have six requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my legislative fellows Nathan Lee, Laura Mosqueda, Sean Philbin, and Montreal Tennessee be granted floor privileges for the duration of their fellowships in my office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2022

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, March 21; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed

to Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521, America COMPETES Act; further, that the cloture motion filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2022, AT 3 P.M.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:07 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 21, 2022, at 3:00 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 17, 2022:

THE JUDICIARY

JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

FRED W. SLAUGHTER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

BIDTAH N. BECKER, OF ARIZONA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2022.

GRETCHEN GONZALEZ DAVIDSON, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2022.

VANESSA NORTHINGTON GAMBLE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2026.

DAVID ANTHONY HAJDU, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2026.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING DR. LYNN MARSHALL FOR WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Dr. Lynn Marshall's journey in public health began when she worked as an education and training coordinator for Healthy Start Coalition. During that time, she joined the Florida Healthy Babies committee and led a subcommittee that consisted of the following community partners: Lakeland Regional Health Hospital, the Florida Department of Health, Healthy Start Coalition, Sunshine Health and Spirit Life Ministries.

In 2019, Dr. Marshall and a handful of community partners hosted the first Melanin Families Matter community event at Lakeland Regional Health Carol Jenkins Barnett Pavilion for Women & Children. In August of 2019, Dr. Marshall took the initiative to incorporate and serve as the president of Melanin Families Matter. She has received proclamations on behalf of Melanin Families Matter from the Polk County Board of County Commissioners, Winter Haven Chain of Lakes Mayor Bradley T. Dantzler, and the City of Lakeland Mayor Bill Mutz. These governmental officers have recognized and publicly declared the month of March to be Melanin Families Matter month.

Dr. Marshall continues to host annual Melanin Families Matter health panels and community events that are open to the public at no cost. In addition to providing education to the Polk County community, Dr. Marshall also spearheads a ''Community Distribution Day'' each year. It is during this time when care packages, educational materials, clothing, food and play items for babies and children are provided to families in need at no cost. As a community advocate, Dr. Marshall has served as a guest speaker on the following platforms: 100 National Coalition of Black Women, Polk State College Women's History month discussion panel, The Empowered Woman, Our Voices Live radio broadcast and more. Dr. Marshall is the wife of Dr. Jarvis L. Marshall, and together they have two beautiful daughters.

CORA FAITH WALKER

HON. CORI BUSH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Ms. BUSH. Madam Speaker, St. Louis and I rise to offer our deepest and most sincere condolences to the family, friends, and loved ones of our dear sister Cora Faith Walker, whose beautiful life was taken from our community far too soon.

As an exemplary public servant, Cora was a champion of transformational policies to lift up St. Louis, as evidenced by her work as a former Missouri State Representative and top policy official in St. Louis County. And in her work and beyond it, Cora was a wonderful light in this world. She was transformative—touching the souls of everyone who encountered her. She embodied a rare form of altruism that shaped her public service and made her an incredible community leader.

She never took the easy way out. Whether it be in her fierce work to deliver justice or her gravity defying ability to climb the long marble Missouri State Capitol steps in a pair of stilettos—even though there was a perfectly good elevator—she did everything with genuineness, style, and class.

Her accomplishments as a public servant are deserving of our highest recognition. She used her expertise as a clinical mental health professional to deliver groundbreaking legislative work, securing the passage of the legislation that created the TraumaInformed Care for Children and Families Board. She led the charge for Medicaid expansion, especially for services geared towards postpartum moms struggling with substance use disorder. And during my service in Congress, Cora has been a close partner in the work to deliver resources to our communities, especially to prevent violent evictions during this deadly pandemic.

Our community is devastated by Cora's passing, and we all will miss her dearly forevermore.

May she be given the flowers she is due, may her legacy of love and service live on, and may she rest in eternal peace and power.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOSEPH F. LONG, JR., RECIPIENT OF THE GREATER PITTSTON FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK'S ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, today I honor Joseph F. Long, Jr. who will be awarded the Achievement Award by the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick at their annual gathering on March 17, 2022.

Joseph attended Bishop Hoban High School. and after graduating in 1982, he continued his education at Kings College, earning a bachelor's degree in elementary education. He went on to receive two master's degrees from Wilkes-University, the first in 2004 in classroom technology and the second in 2006 in educational leadership.

In 1997, Joseph began his teaching career as a middle school math and science teacher at St. Mary's Assumption School in Pittston, Pennsylvania. In 2001, he accepted a position teaching technology at Pittston Area Intermediate Center while also completing his educational leadership training. In 2006, Joseph transitioned from the classroom to administration, working for the Greater Nanticoke Area School District. While at Nanticoke, he was: trained and certified in the Student Assistant Program (SAP) and completed the state mandated National Institute of School Leadership Courses. Joseph then took on the role of principal of Montgomery Avenue Intermediate Center for the Wyoming Area School District. In 2014, he received his Superintendent's Letter of Eligibility from Edinboro University, and today he serves as the superintendent of the Northwest Area School District in Shickshinny.

Always invigorated by being around young people and helping them reach their full potential, Joseph was a successful youth sports coach. He began his coaching career in 1985 at Plains Junior High School for the 7th and 8th grade basketball teams. In 1990, he started coaching basketball at E.L. Meyers High School where he helped lead the varsity team to four Wyoming Valley Conference Championships, one PIAA District II second place finish, and four state tournament appearances. In 1997. Joseph accepted the head varsity coach position at Seton Catholic High School. During his ten years with the Eagles, his teams won over 130 games, two Wyoming Valley Conference Championships, and one PIAA District Two Championship and had two PIAA District II second places finishes and four state tournament appearances. While at Seton, he was named Wyoming Valley Conference Coach of the Year twice. Joseph's coaching career came to an end after four years at Luzerne County Community College.

In addition to his work as an educator and coach. Joseph is a dedicated volunteer in his community. He is an active member of the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, serving as the 104th president of the organization in 2018. He has been the treasurer for the board of directors of the Greater Pittston Library and the Jenkins Township Little League. Since 2013, he has also been the assistant district administrator for the PA District 16/31 Little League Board in charge of the major league boy's baseball division. He is an active member of the Knights of Columbus as a member of the board, and in 2013, he was awarded his Fourth Degree Knighthood.

I am honored to join with the Greater Pittston friendly Sons of St. Patrick in recognizing Joseph for his tireless commitment to serving his community and uplifting young people through sport and education. May he continue to find fulfillment and purpose in this work. I wish him the best this St. Patrick's Day.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF BRIAN MAYES

HON. RALPH NORMAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brian Mayes for his outstanding leadership and service.

Brian is a 1983 graduate of West Mecklenburg High School in Charlotte, North Carolina. Upon graduation, he proudly served in the United States Air Force for four years. Following his military service, Brian spent twenty years as a very popular and highly regarded national gospel performer.

Although Brian still sings, his career focus has since shifted to community service. For 20 years, he served as the Director of Family Life Outreach, an organization that does significant charitable work. In 2014, Brian became the Director of the Boys and Girls Club Jackson Teen Center in Camden where he is known as Mr. BB to many young people. The Center serves as a safe haven for kids after school and is open to all middle and high school students in Kershaw County. From athletics, to academics, to life skills and college preparation, the after-school center not only gives students a place to go, but a place to grow. Brian's wife and life partner, Roberta, also serves at the Jackson Teen Center. Fondly called ''Mom'' or ''Auntie Bertie'' by the teens, she leads the Job Readiness Training program.

Under Brian's leadership, the Center has become one of the best attended programs of its kind in the entire country. Ninety percent of members go on to attend college or join the military upon graduation. During his time at the Center, Brian has developed numerous innovative programs. Some of these programs include ''Make it a Conversation,'' which enables young people to interact with community leaders and experts about topics of interest, and ''Jobs and Employability Training for Teens,'' which provides job skills, training, and internship experiences for high school students. Volunteers at the Center describe the incredible work Brian does as ''powerful.'' His colleagues recognize the ''hope, belief, and positivity'' he gives to his students.

Brian has exceeded expectations in service to our state, highlighted by his receipt of numerous honors and accolades. For example, in 2016, Brian received the Leonard Price Award for Community Service. The following year, Brian was named ''Person of the Year'' by the Camden Chronicle-Independent and received the ''Delta Five Points of Purpose'' Award. He and his wife also received the WIS ''Community Builder'' Award.

On behalf of the 5th District of South Carolina, it is my most sincere pleasure to recognize Brian for his outstanding leadership and lifelong service to our state. I wish him the best of luck throughout his future endeavors, as I am confident he will to continue to serve and find great success in all that he does.

IN HONOR OF JOSEPH RUPSIS

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor a patriotic American, Mr. Joseph Rupsis. Mr. Rupsis lives in Clark County, Kentucky and celebrated his 100th birthday on March 15, 2022.

Mr. Rupsis was born in Albany, New York. He enlisted in the United States Navy in October of 1942 when he was 20 years of age. Following basic training at Great Lakes, Illinois, he was sent to the Pacific Theatre and assigned to the USS *Victoria*, an oil tanker. At the war's end, he was discharged in December of 1945. Mr. Rupsis resumed his work at a factory but signed up to serve in the reserves. During the Korean Conflict, he was called back into service in October of 1950. He was assigned to the USS *Bataan*, an aircraft carrier. His mother passed away while he was serving. Mr. Rupsis attained the rank of Petty Officer Second Class. He was discharged in December of 1951.

Following his discharge in San Diego, Mr. Rupsis decided to remain there, where he met and married his first wife. Mr. Rupsis worked at an aircraft plant, graduated from San Diego State, and worked for many years in radio broadcasting. He later moved to Florida and worked for the Florida prison system, where he retired. After Hurricane Charlie destroyed his home and possessions, Mr. Rupsis moved to Winchester, Kentucky to be near family members. It was there that he met his wife, Mary.

It is my honor to recognize this amazing patriot celebrate his 100th birthday, and appreciate him for his service and sacrifice to our nation during World War II and the Korean Conflict. As a part of ''The Greatest Generation'', Mr. Rupsis was an important part of the war effort to preserve the freedoms that we enjoy today. I am forever grateful for Americans like Joseph Rupsis.

HONORING DORIS MOORE BAILEY FOR WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Doris Moore Bailey's innovative marketing skills for a national youth organization inspired her to develop middle school and teen mom initiatives in four Florida counties and 27 schools to provide services for 1,000 students yearly. An experienced adjunct professor and YMCA Program Director, she believes that no one achieves a successful life without the influence of positive mentoring.

Twice appointed by Florida's Governor Lawton Chiles to The Peace River Basin Board of The Southwest Florida Water Management District, she participated in flyovers of the basin's 105 miles Peace River, Florida's Manatee River that flows into the Gulf of Mexico to Tampa Bay, and Florida's largest storage facility, with 1,147-acre New Wales gypstack, in Polk County.

She established The African American Chamber of Commerce Polk County, Inc, the African American Historical Museum of Lakeland, re-established the Polk County Democratic Black Caucus, organized Polk County USCT and Buffalo Soldiers reenactors, and is a founder of Friends of Cathay Williams Organization, the only female Buffalo Soldier. She advocates for voters' right to access the ballot box and enhancing community resources.

In 2022, she organized the African American Historical Museum of Lakeland—Equal Justice Initiative Lynching Community Remembrance Project, and Polk County's first commemoration of the 56th Anniversary Selma Bridge crossing Jubilee Unity march. She's a Polk County trailblazer spanning 30 years in talk radio as executive producer and host of 'Our Voices'. Moore Bailey and husband of 44 years are parents of two adult children and five grandsons. In 1992, she organized Florida's first Juneteenth Observance. She's a member of New Bethel AME Church, a NAACP Gold Life Member, and a chartered member and past president of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. Chapter, Lakeland. She also authored anthologies: Voices of Unsung Immortal Mothers and Sons of Immortal Mothers.

CELEBRATING THE 120TH ANNIVERSARY OF BARLOW RESPIRATORY HOSPITAL

HON. JIMMY GOMEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Barlow Respiratory Hospital on its 120th anniversary.

Barlow Respiratory Hospital was founded in 1902 as the Barlow Sanatorium, a charity hospital for tuberculosis patients. Since then, Barlow Respiratory Hospital has maintained an uninterrupted focus on respiratory care and is among a few of continuously operating respiratory hospitals in the nation. Their award-winning programs include their expertise in ventilator weaning for post-ICU patients who need specialized care.

Throughout the COVID–19 pandemic, Barlow Respiratory Hospital physicians have served as clinical leaders. Barlow Respiratory Hospital's tradition of care for patients who are critically ill, often hovering between life and death, now includes care for patients who have survived COVID–19. The clinical care teams work together to help patients begin to recover at Barlow Respiratory Hospital.

As the only not-for-profit long-term acute care hospital and the only not-for-profit respiratory hospital in California, Barlow Respiratory Hospital has established a legacy of service to the Los Angeles community.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and celebrating the 120th anniversary of Barlow Respiratory Hospital.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF RETIRED CHIEF WARREN GENE WOODFORK, SR.

HON. TROY A. CARTER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Warren Gene Woodfork, Sr.

Warren Gene Woodfork, Sr., the first African American Superintendent of the New Orleans Police Department, entered into eternal rest on Wednesday, March 9, 2022. Chief Woodfork is the eldest of eight children born in Opelousas, Louisiana. He relocated to New Orleans with his family at a young age. Chief Woodfork is a graduate of Joseph S. Clark High School and attended Xavier University of Louisiana. Chief Woodfork was beyond proud

to have family and friends following in his legacy of law and law enforcement, Ret. United States Postal Inspector, Samuel Huntley, Jr., New Orleans Police Captain, Michelle Woodfork and United States Magistrate, Judge Dana M. Douglas.

Chief Woodfork was appointed in 1985 by the city's first Black mayor, Ernest ''Dutch'' Morial and served a second term under the next mayor, Sidney Barthelemy before retiring in 1991. He was previously employed as a postal clerk and also served his country in the United States Air Force before his 28 year career in law enforcement. Chief Woodfork became the first commander of the Felony Action Squad, which operated for 10 years beginning in 1972.

He was also instrumental in making the Police Department's district captains accessible to neighborhood residents and business owners. Chief Woodfork, a product of the Calliope and Lafitte Housing developments, believed in community engagement. He saw the future of community policing by increasing the visibility of top-ranking officers in their district area and facilitating the regular and open exchange of information between the department with the people and businesses. This was a huge shift in tone for the department and was an innovative practice that brought a lot of success.

A trailblazer in his own right, Chief Woodfork appointed the first female Deputy Chief of the New Orleans Police Department, Yvonne Bechet, and the first female district commander, Carol Hewitt, who was assigned to the Seventh District. He later appointed Commander Hewitt as the first female commander of the Narcotics Drug Abuse unit in NOPD history.

Throughout his administration, Chief Woodfork also sought creative programs and concepts to target the juvenile crime problem and the growing level of violence by including programming in education, music and sports, as the three most important ingredients needed to lead young people away from crime.

Chief Woodfork was a graduate of the FBI National Academy and the John F. Kennedy School of Government. He was a member of the Major Cities Chiefs Association (MCAA), Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), International Association of Chiefs of Police, Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), New Orleans Black Organization of Police (BOP) and the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement, (NOBLE).

Chief Woodfork retired in 1991 to spend more time with his family. Prior to his retirement, he obtained funding for 200 new officers, along with the purchase of additional cars and equipment stating, ''This is a chance for me to give my successor a better start than I had.''

Though he may be gone, I know that Chief Woodfork is still watching over his beloved New Orleans community and beloved family.

HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ZETA OMICRON CHAPTER OF THE OMEGA PSI PHI FRATERNITY

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I wish to recognize and congratulate the Zeta Omicron Chapter of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. on its 75th anniversary.

After being chartered in 1947, at what was then known as Hampton Institute (now Hampton University), Zeta Omicron began a journey to what would be one of Hampton University's finest organizations and a bold representation for positive influence within the community.

Since its beginning, its members have continued to display excellence in their commitment to the chapter's founding principles, which are centered on confronting discrimination in education and the military. As a service and social organization, the Zeta Omicron Chapter of Omega Psi Phi, Inc. has continued to uplift youth and families through countless acts of service, including raising money for scholarships for high school students every year.

In addition to their scholarship program, members also provide meals to families each holiday season and support other organizations through charitable fundraising efforts to advance equity in education and opportunity. The Zeta Omicron chapter also provides youth mentoring programs, which include a conference dedicated to helping students understand the value of education, while pairing those students to important resources. Over two decades ago, the brothers of Zeta Omicron entered the adopt-a-street program and continues this community cleanup effort on Marcella Road throughout the year.

As a historically black university, Hampton University has a rich history of excellence and integrity, paired with incredible academic achievement. The Zeta Omicron chapter contributes to that success. What began as an idea from five founding members—Dr. Fred Inge, Dr. Don A. Davis, Herman G. Cook, Arthur Burke, and Colonel William H. Moses—has flourished as a robust organization built to successfully engage with some of the most important community priorities needed to build a better future. Members of this prestigious organization go on to succeed in careers in government, higher education, medicine, law, and more. It is no surprise that the chapter's historical mission of removing discrimination from the education system and the military continues today as a distinguished voice in the Hampton Roads community.

Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize and honor the Zeta Omicron Chapter of Omega Psi Phi on the celebration of its 75th anniversary and commend its members for their service and achievements over the years.

HONORING MEXICAN AMERICAN RIGHTS ACTIVIST MARY ESTHER BERNAL

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mrs. Mary Esther Bernal who passed away on March 10, 2022. For decades, Mrs. Bernal was integral to the advancement of Mexican American and Latino rights in Texas. Her work changed the lives of countless Texans, and she will be greatly missed.

Mary Esther Bernal was born on March 21, 1935, in San Antonio, Texas. She earned her undergraduate and master's degrees from Our Lady of the Lake University. A talented pianist who was passionate about using music to connect with others, Ms. Bernal taught choir in San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD) during an era when speaking Spanish in Texas schools was against the law.

Instead of bowing to pressures to suppress the culture of her city and her Mexican-American students, Mrs. Bernal celebrated both. Together with her husband, State Senator Joe Bernal, she pushed Texas schools to provide bilingual instruction to English language learners and end English-only laws. As a community leader, Mrs. Bernal served two terms on the SAISD Board of Trustees. Mrs. Bernal received numerous honors for her work as an educator and civic leader.

Mrs. Bernal was inducted into the San Antonio Women's Hall of Fame in 1991 and the National Hispanic Heritage Hall of Honor in 2010 for her contributions to education. Mrs. Bernal is survived by her husband Joe Bernal, sons Richard and Patrick Bernal, daughter Rebecca Villarreal, six grandchildren, and two step-grandchildren. She is preceded in death by her youngest son, Bernard Bernal, who passed away in 2016.

Madam Speaker, San Antonio mourns the loss of a Hispanic icon. We will miss the music she played and the powerful voice she projected for equality. Her efforts benefited countless Texas families, including mine. Although she has passed, we take comfort remembering her through our heritage. I thank Mrs. Bernal for her fight. She will be missed. (Agredezco a la Señora Bernal, gracias por su lucha. Le vamos extrañar.)

HONORING TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY'S AGRICULTURE AND NATIONAL RESOURCES POLICY INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Texas A&M University's (TAMU) Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy (ANRP) Internship Program for the admirable work they do to provide students a front-row seat to experience and understand the policymaking process.

For over 30 years, the ANRP internship program has provided students in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences with the chance to immerse themselves in the legislative process at the state, federal, and international levels. This program helps students obtain internships in a variety of settings that match their career goals in Washington, D.C.; Austin, Texas; and Rome, Italy, and provides the opportunity to use their academic knowledge in a professional setting while gaining real-world experience.

From 2013 to 2021, I had the pleasure of hosting 25 ANRP interns in my Washington, D.C. office, many of whom went on to pursue careers in teaching, law, agriculture, and other commendable fields of work. Thanks to the excellent education they received at TAMU and the unparalleled experience they gained through the ANRP program, two of those students, Mickeala Carter and Hannah Followill,

rose through the ranks to become full-time staff members on my team. Both Mickeala and Hannah are now government professionals in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce, respectively.

It has been an absolute pleasure to work with the students from this program during my tenure in Congress, and I commend the ANRP Internship Program for the great work they do in shaping the leaders of tomorrow.

HONORING CINDY LEWIS FOR WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Cindy Lewis has dedicated her nearly 33-year career at the Kissimmee/Osceola County Chamber of Commerce to serving the business community of Osceola County. A native Floridian, Cindy was born in Deland, Florida as the second daughter of Johnny and Annette Wimberly. She has called Central Florida her home for her entire life and is a proud graduate of Osceola High School's Class of 1980.

Cindy began her career with the Kissimmee/Osceola County Chamber of Commerce as an Administrative Assistant in 1989, was promoted to Office Manager in 1994, and Executive Vice President in 2008. In her time at the Chamber, Cindy was recognized as Chamber Professional of the Year in 2017 by the Florida Association of Chamber Professionals (FACP), she received her certification as a Florida Certified Chamber Professional (FCCP) and is currently in her fourth year at the Institute for Organization Management (IOM), a professional development program of the U.S. Chamber Foundation from which she will graduate in June 2022 with the IOM certification. During her tenure at the Kissimmee/Osceola Chamber, the Chamber has been recognized by the Florida Association of Chamber Professionals (FACP) as Chamber of the Year in the years 2001, 2017, and 2021. Cindy is a graduate of Leadership Osceola.

Cindy has been married to Troy Lewis, the love of her life, for 32 years. Cindy and Troy own a ranch in Clermont, FL filled with cattle, donkeys, chickens, cats, and two spoiled dogs who are their pride and joy. When she is not working or ranching, she enjoys spending time with her husband boating, enjoying other outdoor activities, learning new recipes, vacationing in the Florida Keys, and spending time with family and friends.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, March 16, 2022, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: NAY on Roll Call No. 74; YEA on Roll Call No. 75; YEA on Roll Call No. 76; and YEA on Roll Call No. 77.

HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BETA CHI CHAPTER OF THE KAPPA ALPHA PSI FRATERNITY

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th anniversary of the founding of the Beta Chi Chapter of the Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Incorporated at Hampton University in Hampton, Virginia.

The Beta Chi Chapter has been the gateway for over 400 men into the Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity which was founded 111 years ago by ten founders who overcame racism and other hardships at Indiana University and created an organization that has played a major role in the advancement of African-Americans and American history. Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity Inc. is dedicated to achievement and the development of leaders and has over 160,000 members and chapters on five continents.

Since 1947, the men of the Beta Chi Chapter have endeavored and achieved in many occupations including the military, education, health care, business, entrepreneurship, journalism, law enforcement, and the law. The chapter has embraced community service and has had a positive impact on the Hampton and greater Hampton Roads community through volunteering at the Hampton Boys and Girls Club, organizing and leading activities for the elderly, conducting food drives, and donating turkeys and other food during Thanksgiving.

The chapter currently has two philanthropic and scholarship entities, The Ron Young Scholarship and the Kapex Foundation, both of which support and empower students in their college journeys. The chapter members have mentored hundreds of students in their chosen majors and provided valuable advice and connections once students leave Hampton University.

In closing, Madam Speaker, let us celebrate 75 years of Beta Chi Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc.'s achievement at Hampton University. As the chapter forges onward, it carries with it a continued commitment to supporting Hampton University and the greater Hampton Roads community, while also upholding the high standards of the fraternity and its members.

CELEBRATING THE TEN-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF LEMON POPPY KITCHEN

HON. JIMMY GOMEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Lemon Poppy Kitchen restaurant in the community of Glassell Park on its ten-year anniversary.

Lemon Poppy Kitchen opened for business in March 2012 with hardly any money, a couple of handmade tables, and a counter crafted by a friend on the promise of free ice coffee and biscuits. The three owners Katie Kildow, Anca Caliman, and Jack Wilson were the cooks, waiters, and cashiers.

From your first interaction with Lemon Poppy Kitchen, you know you are in for a treat. "We make food from scratch with love," says Anca. The team is a compassionate group that is engaged with the Glassell Park community and beyond. During the pandemic, Lemon Poppy Kitchen worked with the Glassell Park Improvement Association to provide 50 cooked meals a day, six days a week, for seniors. They have also helped raise funds for the homeless community of Skid Row in Los Angeles.

Once you make your first order at the restaurant you feel the sense of community. "We wanted to make a spot where everyone wants to be," says Katie. Ten years later the Glassell Park community has shown that Lemon Poppy Kitchen is the go-to spot for good coffee, pastries, and meals. "We are happy we made it [to ten years]. There have been some rough patches, but the people that come here feel like family after a while," says Jack.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Katie, Anca, Jack and Lemon Poppy Kitchen on their ten-year anniversary. I also extend to all of them my best wishes for many more years of success. I invite my colleagues to stop by Lemon Poppy Kitchen the next time they are in Los Angeles.

HONORING SARAH JOHNSTON FOR WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Sarah Johnston serves as the Vice President of Development of the Boys & Girls Club of Central Florida. She began her career in the Development field in 2002 after graduating from the University of Central Florida. Her goal has always been to obtain a leadership position that utilizes and challenges her abilities to maximize results, build strong relationships and honor her commitment to excellence, innovation, and community. She is a mission driven professional with over 20 years of experience, building and sustaining excellent investor relationships with a measurable track record of success. Through her experience she has demonstrated expertise in creating philanthropic cultures by utilizing a strategic, collaborative, data driven, results-oriented mindset.

In her eyes, her team's responsibility is to serve as a connector for individuals in the community and their passion for investing in the future of children of promise. Sarah's favorite part of her role is building bridges with investors and sharing the potential impact they can make through the stories of the Club Members she serves. She believes there is nothing more important than telling a child you believe in them, that regardless of zip code or economic status of their family—they deserve a chance to realize their dreams. In her service to the community, Sarah has raised over $25 million dollars in hope and opportunity.

Ultimately, she is driven every day by the bravery of the Club members she serves who face and overcome unimaginable obstacles and the success they achieve through mentors and Club programming. For her, being able to

watch a Club member be the first in their family to walk across a stage to receive a high school diploma, and see the pride light up in their eyes, keeps her believing that every day is an opportunity to be great.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF CHIEF ROBINSON

HON. RALPH NORMAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chief C.A. ''Andy'' Robinson and his outstanding service to our state. Chief Robinson has spent much of his life as a law enforcement officer and is a dedicated and compassionate member of our community.

Chief Robinson has spent 25 years serving his community and as a law enforcement officer for various municipal and county agencies. Throughout the last eleven years, he has served as Chief for the York Police Department. Under Chief Robinson's leadership, the York Police Department has implemented a community policing philosophy to foster and bridge connections with businesses, local civics organizations, churches, schools, and citizens across York. Some of these initiatives include York's National Night Out, hosting summer youth camps, fundraisers, blood drives, and holiday outreach programs.

In addition to his outstanding work in law enforcement, Chief Robinson also serves on numerous boards and committees. For example, Chief Robinson is a past President of the South Carolina Police Chiefs Association (SCPCA). He has also served as Chairman of the York County Law Enforcement Governing Board since 2011 and is an active member of the South Carolina Law Enforcement Officers' Association, International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the FBI National Academy Associations. Additionally, Chief Robinson has spoken to several South Carolina House and Senate subcommittees on various topics.

Chief Robinson is dependable, compassionate, and has earned the respect of law enforcement and citizens all over South Carolina. He has exceeded expectations in service to our state, highlighted by his receipt of numerous honors and accolades. For example, Chief Robinson is the only York Police Chief to receive the Strom Thurmond Award for Excellence in Law Enforcement, which is the highest law enforcement honor in the state. He also received an award for Outstanding Service to the Community of York by the York Men's Club.

On behalf of the 5th District of South Carolina, it is my most sincere pleasure to recognize Chief Robinson for his outstanding leadership and service to our state. I wish him the best of luck throughout his future endeavors, as I am confident he will continue to serve and find great success in all that he does.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST BAT MITZVAH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the centennial anniversary of the first Bat Mitzvah of an American girl, which took place on March 18, 1922, at the Society for the Advancement of Judaism (SAJ) in New York City.

At 12 years of age, Judith Kaplan became the first girl on American soil to formally step into the Jewish community by becoming a Bat Mitzvah (daughter of the commandments). Her father, Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan, founded SAJ just three months prior, in January of 1922. He believed strongly that girls should have equal religious opportunities, so he arranged for his daughter to read from the Torah soon after the synagogue was created.

This momentous occasion helped begin the meaningful inclusion of women and girls in Jewish religious life. Bat Mitzvahs became common place, Jewish women started to serve in leadership roles in synagogues and organizations, and exactly 50 years later, the first female rabbi in American history was ordained by a rabbinical seminary.

Judith Kaplan's Bat Mitzvah was also the first in a long line of countless innovative and groundbreaking advancements in Jewish thought and practice by SAJ and their leadership.

Rabbi Kaplan established SAJ as the first synagogue based on the principles of Reconstruction, which views Judaism as a constantly evolving civilization. He believed that Jewish life was rooted in tradition but also able to adapt alongside the ever-changing circumstances of wider society under that guiding principle.

Since Rabbi Kaplan's pioneering tenure, SAJ has continued to live up to his powerful legacy of American Jewish innovation. The synagogue is considered a cornerstone of Jewish life in New York's Upper West Side. SAJ, led by an all-female clergy and staff, is an intellectual stalwart in the community that is dedicated to practicing a modern, American, egalitarian form of Judaism. They advance Jewish education, arts, music, and cultural self-expression as vital to the religious practice.

SAJ upholds the Jewish tenet of tikkun olam, a Hebrew phrase that means to repair the world. The synagogue embodies this teaching by working for economic, immigrant, and reproductive justice; affirming LGBTQ+ members and interfaith families; and actively supporting and partnering with New York City's Westside Campaign Against Hunger to fight against food insecurity.

I honor Judith Kaplan's courage and celebrate the 100th anniversary of her groundbreaking Bat Mitzvah.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Society for the Advancement of Judaism's remarkable contributions to the Jewish community in New York City and all over the world.

IN RECOGNITION OF WILLIAM J. THORNTON, RECIPIENT OF THE GREATER PITTSTON FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK SWINGLE AWARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, today I honor William J. Thornton who will be awarded the W. Francis Swingle Award by the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick at their annual gathering on March 17, 2022.

Bill, son of Bill Thornton and Kathie Bender Elechko, was raised in West Pittston, Pennsylvania, along with his four siblings. He graduated from Wyoming Area High School with the Class of 1994, and he attended Penn State University where he earned a degree in management science and information systems. He later went on to receive an MBA in finance from Pepperdine University in Malibu, California.

Bill began his career as a technology consultant working in the Philadelphia area with life sciences companies including Pfizer, Roche, Johnson & Johnson, and Eli Lily. He then transitioned to working as a computer programmer for Amgen, a biotech company that specializes in products for treatment of blood disorders, osteoporosis, and other inflammatory conditions. Continuing his work on the technical side of health care, Bill joined the team at Allergan, a global leader in medical aesthetics, eye care, and neurological disorders. He spent 11 years at Allergan as an IT executive working across business units in research and development, manufacturing, sales, and marketing, and he was the IT leader for the emerging markets of Latin America and Asia, supporting 17 countries and $1 billion in revenue. Bill currently serves as the Chief Information Officer for Sarepta Therapeutics in Cambridge, Massachusetts. His role at Sarepta supports their mission to engineer solutions for rare diseases with science that is on the forefront of precision genetic medicine. Bill is also a partner and member of Cybersecurity at MIT Sloan School of Management.

Bill is a sustaining member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. His maternal grandfather, Ted Bender, proudly served as the 60th president of the organization in 1973. Bill was awarded the Friendly Sons Annual Student Scholarship in 1994, and his wife, Susan, was a scholarship recipient in 1995.

Bill is a dedicated volunteer and is actively involved in his local community to support youth sports and school events. He and his wife have three daughters, Erin, Emily, and Allie.

I am honored to join with the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in recognizing Bill as the 2022 Swingle Award Winner. He has dedicated his career to supporting cutting edge medical research in the life sciences industry while also volunteering his time to support his community. May he continue to find fulfillment in his work and giving back to his fellow citizens.

HONORING ASMA PATEL FOR WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Asma Patel is a board-certified attorney who has diligently served and continues to serve the Osceola County community. Ms. Patel holds dual degrees with honors in Psychology and Legal Studies as well as a Juris Doctor degree. During her law school career, Ms. Patel was a student ambassador, mentor, and the President of the Muslim Law School Association at her alma mater. She honed her dispute resolution skills by competing in and ultimately winning first place in an International Law School Mediation Tournament. During this time, she continued to demonstrate her dedication to serving her community as a guardian ad item fellow. In this role, she played a crucial role as a representative for abused, abandoned, and/or neglected children.

Ms. Patel has spearheaded community initiatives aimed at ending domestic violence. As a certified domestic abuse victim advocate, she has assisted survivors in crisis by providing essential resources and support. In an effort to create awareness, she has hosted family empowerment seminars and tabled at events aimed at tackling domestic abuse.

Through mentorship, extensive networking, and volunteerism, Ms. Patel has worked with marginalized and vulnerable communities, striving to bring light and change to the social injustices that plague them. Most recently, she has begun to help address the issue of inaccessibility to feminine hygiene products by providing these products to local Title I schools. Ms. Patel's bridge the gap initiatives in Osceola County are inspired by her desire to take action that empowers women to be courageous in the pursuit of their dreams.

HONORING LILLIAN TAMAYO

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lillian Tamayo, a distinguished local health care advocate, on her recent retirement. For more than 20 years, Lillian has been a champion for women, teens, and members of the LGBTQIA+ community across South Florida. She worked tirelessly to increase their access to and awareness of quality affordable health care services.

As President and CEO of Planned Parenthood of South, East and North Florida, Lillian expanded the organization's reach to eight of the state's most diverse counties and broadened its services to historically overlooked groups. One of the most successful initiatives that she led, La Promesa, engaged Latina women who were previously underserved in South Florida.

During the most difficult times in the abortion movement, Lillian stood strong and fearlessly led in the fight for reproductive freedom. She advocated in federal court to block past Florida laws designed to limit abortions. Lillian also fought to extend health services and counseling options to South Florida teens and members of the LGBTQIA+ community. As a result of her advocacy, Planned Parenthood is now a judgement-free zone where young people can go to receive HIV and STI screenings, hormone therapy, discuss birth control options, and receive mental health counseling.

Lillian's dedication to health care access and education is truly admirable. Her work has created a space in which women and men across Florida can feel safe for years to come. I am proud to celebrate her today and wish her the very best on her retirement.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HAMPTON UNIVERSITY CHOIR

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the Hampton University Choir on its 150th anniversary.

The Hampton University Choir was established in 1870 as the Hampton Singers just a few years after Hampton University was founded in 1868 as the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. Since then, Hampton University has continued to break new ground in academic achievement as one of Virginia's top Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

The university's motto is "The Standard of Excellence, an Education for Life", and that is exactly what the Hampton University Choir has exemplified over the last 150 years. As the primary touring ensemble for the university, the Choir has distinguished itself by performing in numerous notable venues across the United States and abroad, including Carnegie Hall and the Kennedy Center. The Hampton University Choir even performed at the second Inauguration of President William Jefferson Clinton in 1997.

I want to congratulate the President of Hampton University, Dr. William R. Harvey, the Director of University Choirs, Omar Dickenson, and the Assistant Director of Alumni Affairs, Dr. Joan Wickham for their years of service and dedication to the Hampton University community. The Hampton University Choir has and continues to be an essential piece of what makes Hampton University so special.

Congratulations to the Hampton University Choir on their 150th anniversary. I wish them many more years of success.

HONORING CALEB OGILVIE

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, the Commonwealth of Virginia mourns the loss of Officer Caleb Daniel Ogilvie of the Covington Police Department.

Officer Ogilvie was killed in the line of duty on March 14, 2022, at the age of 35. Though he was taken too soon, his life was evidence of his noble commitment to protecting the safety and freedom of others above himself.

He was born in Wisconsin to Daniel Raymond Ogilvie and Delora Anne Chambers Ogilvie.

Before serving the City of Covington in law enforcement, Officer Ogilvie served his country for four years in the United States Marine Corps. Two of his tours were spent in Iraq and Afghanistan. He was also a volunteer firefighter and an emergency medical technician for Roanoke County.

Officer Ogilvie was a loving father, husband, son, brother, and friend. Along with his parents, he is survived by his wife, Natasha Erin Ogilvie; and four daughters, Emersyn and Wrenley Ogilvie, and Kileigh and Rilyn Ogilvie and their mother, Malarie Ogilvie. He is also survived by his sister, Abigail Chave, and two brothers, Rian and Benjamin Ogilvie; along with many other beloved close family and friends.

Officer Ogilvie lived a life of self-sacrifice. He was a distinguished public servant who put his life on the line every day as he courageously defended those around him. The death of Officer Ogilvie is a grievous loss to the Commonwealth of Virginia and the City of Covington. I mourn his loss, yet I am grateful that he and the other men and women of law enforcement step forward to protect us knowing full well the risks they face. His bravery and selfless service will not be forgotten.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BARBARA ROWELL

HON. DARIN LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Barbara Rowell of Quincy, Illinois, who passed away in November 2021 at the age of 85.

A native of Quincy, Illinois, Barbara Rowell attended Culver Stockton College where she majored in Speech and Drama and graduated Cum Laude in 1958. During her time at Culver Stockton College, Barbara was active in student theater, Greek life, and was the host of the Culver Stockton Callboard television show. During which, she had the opportunity to interview then President of the Screen Actors Guild, and future President of the United States, Ronald Reagan.

Barbara's passion for the theater and her community led her back to her hometown, Quincy, where she taught Speech and Drama courses at Quincy High School and Central High School. In addition, she was an active leader in the Quincy Live Theater where she held the title of actress, managing and artistic director, and board member. During her tenure at the Quincy Live Theater, she was a part of an estimated 136 productions.

Barbara was not only an iconic figure in the Quincy community but provided critical leadership in improving the Quincy Community Theater. Her accolades demonstrate how her determination and vision did not go unnoticed. Barbara was a 25-year member of the American Association of Community Theaters and recipient of the YWCA Woman of Achievement Award and the City of Quincy Arts Award. The Quincy community has been fortunate to benefit under the leadership of Barbara Rowell.

I want to offer my condolences to the Rowell family and the people of Quincy on the loss of a great woman. Barbara left a lasting impact on those who had the pleasure of knowing her. May her memory be eternal.

HONORING ASHLEE MAREE WRIGHT FOR WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Ashlee Maree Wright is a mother, dynamic visionary, and results-oriented leader. She founded Wright on Time Educational Services (WOT) in 2006. which provides customized educational solutions to communities that desire to open a school, solve an educational problem, or require management services. WOT focuses on developing innovative learning environments that cultivate the entire student in a way that empowers them to be impactful leaders of tomorrow.

As Founder of New Beginnings High School (NBHS), in 2011, Ashlee successfully implemented a unique educational model that provides an innovative and nurturing educational experience, which is available to ALL students in Central Florida. Thousands of students who were once unsuccessful in the traditional public-school model are now thriving, graduating from high school, and pursuing post-graduate opportunities due to Ashlee's unparalleled work.

Before her role as Founder of NBHS, Ashlee established herself as an education professional by being an exceptional teacher and ultimately climbing the career ladder to become a principal at the age of 25. As a result of her modus operandi, she is widely acclaimed as the business leader who genuinely cares about the growth of each child. Her ability to effectively raise students' academic prowess and self-esteem helps bolster their performance amidst any present challenges they may have. Today, she builds and operates schools utilizing her education ethos to replicate her success.

Ms. Wright graduated from Florida State University in 2003, gave birth to the beautiful and precocious Victoria Maree in 2007, and started her own charter system in 2010. Her passion, upbringing and love for empowering others through education, laid the framework for her unique education and management methodology. Building on her parents' legacy, award-winning educators Dr. Clint & Debra Wright, Ashlee continues to shift the education paradigm and change lives for the better, one community at a time.

IN MEMORY OF MARLOWE STOUDAMIRE

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, today I want to honor the legacy of Marlowe Stoudamire, a beloved community leader in Michigan's 13th District we lost too soon to COVID–19 in 2020.

Marlowe Stoudamire was an entrepreneur who worked hard to uplift the people of Detroit and to advocate for a better quality of life. He gave his time to many community-based organizations, generating countless ideas and projects to raise Detroit's profile while honoring its legacy and keeping an eye towards its future. Beyond his incredible work, Marlowe Stoudamire was a loving spouse and father. He had an infectious smile and enthusiastic approach to the work he undertook.

Marlowe Stoudamire's pride in his Detroit roots shined through in everything he did. He had an especially close relationship with Eastside Community Network, a community empowerment organization in Detroit. I am incredibly proud to uplift Marlowe's work on the 2nd year anniversary of his passing and in celebration of the opening of the Stoudamire Wellness HUB on Detroit's eastside in honor of his legacy.

Please join me in recognizing the outstanding legacy of Marlowe Stoudamire as we honor his memory.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT J. JOYCE, THE GREATER PITTSTON FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, today I honor Robert J. Joyce who will be named the Man of the Year by the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick at their annual gathering on March 17, 2022.

Bob, a lifelong resident of Avoca, Pennsylvania, is the son of the late Robert and Eleanor Burns Joyce. He graduated from Pittston Area High School before attending the Pennsylvania State University's Smeal College of Business where he earned his Bachelor of Science degree. He then studied finance at the graduate level at the University of Scranton's Kania School of Management. He is a graduate of the Stonier Graduate School of Banking at the University of Delaware and Leadership Wilkes-Barre.

Bob has had a successful career in the finance and insurance industries. He served as the Vice President of Finance at the Eastern Bank, N.A. in Wilkes-Barre, and he is currently a Vice President of the Plateau Group, Inc., an insurance holding company. He is responsible for managing, marketing, and distribution of specialty insurance lines for lenders throughout New England and the Mid Atlantic. He held similar roles at AIG American General and USLIFE Corporation. Bob shares his expertise in the industry by serving on the board of directors for the Pennsylvania Financial Services Association and as a member of the Independent Community Bankers Association of America and the Pennsylvania Association of Community Bankers.

In addition to his professional pursuits, Bob is an active community volunteer. He is a member of Queen of the Apostles Parish where he serves on the Finance Council. He is a Trustee and Third-Degree member of the Knights of Columbus Cardinal John J. O'Connor Council 12967 in Avoca. He has volunteered as a youth sports coach for the Avoca-Dupont Little League and managed the Avoca-Dupont-Pittston Teener League Team. He was a co-founder of the Our Lady of Peace-Holy Cross Junior High School Baseball Team. He is a longtime member of and former basketball coach for the Avoca Jolly Boys Association. Bob is also a proud member of the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick and served as Toastmaster for the 90th annual gathering in 2004.

Bob is married to Noreen Nixon Joyce, and they have two children, Bobby, a Philadelphia-based accountant, and Bridgeen, a graduate student at Georgetown University.

I am honored to join the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in recognizing Bob as the 2022 Man of the Year. He has built a successful career in finance while continuing to honor his Avoca roots by tirelessly giving back to and supporting his community. May he continue to find professional success and satisfaction in community-based endeavors. I wish him the best this St. Patrick's Day.

HONORING DEPUTY CHIEF BETTY HOLLAND FOR WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Deputy Chief Betty Holland is a 34-year veteran of the Law Enforcement Profession. She currently works for the Kissimmee Police Department as Deputy Chief of the Operations Bureau. Before coming to the Kissimmee Police Department in March of 2018, she worked for the Polk County Sheriff's Office for 30 years where she retired as a Captain. Deputy Chief Holland has held several prominent supervisory positions in the law enforcement community, including her time as the Criminal and Strategic Investigation's Lieutenant and overseeing the Criminal Justice Academy as a Captain.

Deputy Chief Holland received her Bachelor of Science in Business and Professional Leadership from Southeastern University, and her Master of Public Administration from Troy University. In addition, she is a graduate of the Southern Police Institute's Administrative Officers Course from the University of Louisville, and a graduate of the Certified Public Manager Program from Florida State University.

Deputy Chief Holland's first thoughts of a law enforcement career surfaced at 15. Her best friend's dad was a retired Deputy Sheriff, which sparked her interest in Law Enforcement. This interest quickly developed into a passion, and when she graduated from High School, she immediately accepted a position at the Polk County Sheriff's Office.

Deputy Chief Betty Holland's career goals include becoming Chief of Police with the Kissimmee Police Department and continuing to build relationships with the community. She is passionate about lowering crime rates with innovative new deterrent measures, holding public servants to higher standards and expectations, and creating more open lines of communication between officers and civilians. Her actions regarding these objectives remain a consistent measure of her interests in the betterment of the field of law enforcement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, I was unable to vote on Roll Call vote No. 72: Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 5001, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to continue to implement endangered fish recovery programs for the Upper Colorado and San Juan River Basins, and for the other purposes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

FEBRUARY CONSTITUENTS OF THE MONTH

HON. MIKE LEVIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Cynthia and W.B. May, two veterans and owners of Cynthia's Artistic Expressions in Oceanside, California, as my Constituents of the Month for their invaluable contributions to our community.

After both serving in the Navy during the Gulf War, W.B. was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder, and Cynthia was diagnosed with anxiety. Once they separated from the military, they realized they needed a way to express themselves and manage their post-traumatic stress and anxiety. They opened Cynthia's Artistic Expressions in order to help veterans and others deal with mental or emotional health challenges, while also making art more accessible, and their establishment has become an integral piece of our Oceanside community. Since they opened their doors, they have seen countless veterans, servicemembers, and civilians benefit from therapeutic art healing. At a time when our nation is grappling with tragic rates of veteran suicide, I am very grateful that they provide this healing opportunity for our local military community.

Cynthia and W.B. strengthen our community far beyond the doors of their art studio, too. They are known for doing extensive outreach to the community of veterans and military families around Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, hosting food drives through their church, Shiloh Church of God in Christ in Oceanside, on the last Thursday of every month for servicemembers and their families who struggle with food insecurity. According to the San Diego Food Bank, nearly 39,000 veterans and active-duty military personnel and their dependents use their services every month, so the work that Cynthia and W.B. do to help feed military families is critically important. They have also worked with vet centers and retirement homes to lighten the facilities with fine art, and they have also donated their time to organizations like the Boys and Girls Club, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and the North County African American Women's Association (NCAAWA).

I created a Constituent of the Month program to recognize local individuals who give back to our community in extraordinary ways, but who often don't receive the recognition they deserve. Cynthia and W.B. certainly meet that criteria, and I cannot thank them enough for everything they have contributed to make Oceanside a brighter, healthier place. It's also my honor to recognize them during Black History Month, when we celebrate the contributions and accomplishments of Black Americans throughout our Nation's history. On behalf of a proud and grateful community, it's my pleasure to recognize them as our Constituents of the Month.

HONORING YULONDA BELL FOR WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Yulonda Bell serves as Associate Dean for Student Services at Polk State College, where she listens to, learns from, and encourages people from all walks of life to achieve their dreams. Bell is a strong leader who does not seek the spotlight and prefers to work in the background providing guidance and support that fosters student success.

Born and raised in Bartow, Bell was a teen parent who overcame obstacles to achieve her diploma and provide for her family. Her perseverance resulted in her achievement of an associate degree from Polk Community College, a bachelor's degree from Warner University, and a master's degree from Webster University—all while raising two sons.

She first served Polk County Public Schools, followed by positions with the Florida Department of Children and Families, and finally Polk State College. She was the first in her family to achieve a college diploma, providing her with an understanding of the challenges that students of color and first-generation-in-college students face as they navigate higher education.

She is a leader on campus. serving as an advisor to the Black Student Union, a founder of S.I.S.T.E.R.S. (Strong, Independent Sisters, That Encourage, Respect, and Survive), and a mentor for Polk State Basketball and STEM Club students.

She also invests time as a member of the organizing committee for the City of Winter Haven Juneteenth Celebration, serving on the City of Winter Haven's Martin Luther King Committee, volunteering at the Neighborhood Service Center, and participating in Lift Lakeland to improve race relations and expand economic, education, and civic involvement.

Bell lives Maya Angelou's quote, "People will forget what you said, people will forget what you did, but people will never forget how you made them feel," as she plays an important role in supporting students and celebrating their achievements.

RECOGNIZING THE WOMEN'S CLUB OF BAKERSFIELD

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Women's Club of Bakersfield on their 126th birthday.

Founded in 1896, the Women's Club of Bakersfield is the oldest cultural club in Kern County. They erected their first building in 1900 and after outgrowing it, moved into their current home in November 1921.

The Women's Club not only provides a dedicated space for women to organize, but they also have a rich history of philanthropic work within the community. Some of the Club's achievements include their advocacy for Women's Suffrage, help to create the first public library in Bakersfield, and preservation efforts for the Beale Clock Tower and California Redwoods. They also provide hundreds of thousands of dollars in scholarships to local students and do important work to support local troops and veterans.

Their dedication to service and giving back has been felt by thousands of people throughout Kern County. These women of all ages and backgrounds are a true testament to the passion and selflessness that epitomizes our Central Valley community.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Women's Club of Bakersfield for 126 years of service to the Bakersfield community.

COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY HEALTH CARELINK

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today commemorating the 25th anniversary of the University Health CareLink. For more than two decades, CareLink has provided invaluable healthcare services to Bexar County's most vulnerable residents. I am honored to recognize their efforts this day.

Bexar County has long struggled to make sure that every resident can access consistent, high-quality health care. Many county residents live below the poverty line, are uninsured, and struggle to get by. Since 1997, CareLink under University Health System has stepped up to meet the needs facing our less fortunate. University Health has transformed the lives of the uninsured by offering its members comprehensive and flexible care based on each member's unique circumstance.

For 25 years CareLink has provided 461,472 low-income, uninsured residents access to a full range of medical services. CareLink now averages 27,850 members each month and connects 100 percent of its members with a health care provider. CareLink has become a model for the nation in providing access to essential and affordable health care services.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing 25 years of invaluable service by University Health CareLink. I am confident that

they will continue to provide vital services to our community for years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAKE D. MOORE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 75.

HONORING LAUDI CAMPO FOR WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Laudi Campo was born and raised in Morovis, Puerto Rico. Through a twenty-five-year professional trajectory in Communications, Government, and Nonprofits, she continues to build organizations, create partnerships, and implement innovative outreach and services for the community.

Her career started at the Puerto Rico Senate as a Communications Specialist. She then became an English teacher and later gained valuable experience in federal grant management in the private sector. As Public Relations Director for the Vega Alta city, her most notable contribution became a radio program to connect the community with the local government.

In 2011, she moved with her family to Orlando, where she has been a noteworthy player in Hispanic relations in Central Florida. As a Spanish-language teacher, she acquired valuable insight into the education system. But her passion for community work reignited at the Orange County Property Appraiser and the City of Orlando's District 2 office, a sector rich in diversity and community pride, where she helped people of different nationalities. One of the most significant achievements became her work on the Trust Act Policy, which was approved unanimously by the Orlando City Council and helps non-citizens who are crime victims.

In 2019 Laudi was named Deputy Director for Hispanic Federation—Florida, the nation's premier Latino nonprofit. She directed the Census, Voter Registration, and COVID–19 media campaigns during the pandemic. In 2021 she became HF Florida State Director. She expanded services and spearheaded a massive effort to vaccinate 13,000 individuals and educate more than 1 million Floridians on vaccines. She foresaw a pandemic aftershock and provided $1 million in financial aid to local nonprofits. Laudi continues to forge partnerships and advocate for affordable housing, immigration, environmental justice, and fair redistricting. Most recently, she was recognized by the 2021 Tech Innovadores for her work in digital inclusion.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1229–S1260

Measures Introduced: Twenty-four bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3859–3882, S.J. Res. 42, and S. Res. 550–553. **Pages S1253–54**

Measures Passed:

Safe Connections Act: Senate passed S. 120, to prevent and respond to the misuse of communications services that facilitates domestic violence and other crimes, after withdrawing the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S1246–48**

Cortez Masto (for Schatz/Fischer) Amendment No. 5001, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S1246–48**

Recognizing contributions of AmeriCorps: Senate agreed to S. Res. 551, recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers to the lives of the people of the United States. **Page S1248**

Measures Considered:

America Competes Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 4521, to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology. **Pages S1237–38**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, March 17, 2022, a vote on cloture will occur 5:30 p.m., on Monday, March 21, 2022. **Pages S1237–38**

Prior to the consideration of this measure, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1237**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, March 21, 2022; and that the motion to invoke cloture thereon ripen at 5:30 p.m. **Pages S1259–60**

Nathan Nomination: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit. **Pages S1229–36, S1238–39**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 96), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S1239**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 63 yeas to 36 nays (Vote No. EX. 94), Jacqueline Scott Corley, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California. **Pages S1236–37**

By 57 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. EX. 95), Fred W. Slaughter, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California. **Page S1237**

Bidtah N. Becker, of Arizona, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022.

Gretchen Gonzalez Davidson, of Michigan, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022.

Vanessa Northington Gamble, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2026.

David Anthony Hajdu, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2026. **Page S1246**

Messages from the House: **Page S1252**

Measures Referred: **Page S1252**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S1252**

Executive Communications: **Page S1252**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S1253**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1254–55**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1255–57**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1251–52**

Amendments Submitted: Pages S1257–59

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S1259

Privileges of the Floor: Page S1259

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—96) Pages S1237, S1239

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:07 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, March 21, 2022. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1259–60.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

RUSSIA'S INVASION OF UKRAINE

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on Russia's invasion of Ukraine from Laura K. Cooper, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Russia, Ukraine, and Eurasia, Blake Puckett, Senior Defense Intelligence Analyst for Russia and Eurasia, and Rear Admiral Oliver T. Lewis, USN, Deputy Director for Political-Military Affairs for Europe, NATO, Russia, Joint Staff J–5, all of the Department of Defense.

DIGITAL ASSETS IN ILLICIT FINANCE

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the role of digital assets in illicit finance, after receiving testimony from Jonathan Levin, Chainalysis Inc., New York, New York; Michael Mosier, Espresso Systems, Vienna, Virginia; Michael Chobanian, Blockchain Association of Ukraine, Kiev; and Shane T. Stansbury, Duke University School of Law, Durham, North Carolina.

NOMINATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Kathryn Huff, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Nuclear Energy), after the nominee testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

CHARITABLE GIVING

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine charitable giving and trends in the nonprofit sector, after receiving testimony from Daniel J. Cardinali, Independent Sector, and C. Eugene Steuerle, Urban Brookings Tax Policy Center, both of Washington, D.C.; Susannah Morgan, Oregon Food Bank, Portland; and Una Osili, Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, Indianapolis.

PANDEMIC RESPONSE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine pandemic response and accountability, focusing on reducing fraud and expanding access to COVID–19 relief through effective oversight, after receiving testimony from Jason S. Miller, Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget; Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; Michael E. Horowitz, Chair, Pandemic Response Accountability Committee, and Inspector General, Department of Justice; and Larry D. Turner, Inspector General, Department of Labor.

FINANCIAL INCLUSION FOR UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine building financial inclusion for America's underserved populations, after receiving testimony from Lori A. Trawinski, AARP, Alexandria, Virginia; Stephen Gilchrist, South Carolina African American Chamber of Commerce, Columbus; Kai Stinchcombe, True Link Financial, Healdsburg, California; and Shelley Jaspering, Ames, Iowa.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 40 public bills, H.R. 7108–7147; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 77; and H. Res. 989–991, were introduced. Pages H3825–27

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H3828–29

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Jackson Lee to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H3779

Recess: The House recessed at 11:07 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. Page H3787

Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal Act: The House passed H.R. 963, to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration, by a

yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 209 nays, Roll No. 81. **Pages H3788–98, H3811–13**

Rejected the Bentz motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, by a yea-and-nay vote of 208 yeas to 222 nays, Roll No. 80. **Page H3812**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–34 shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. **Pages H3788–89**

Rejected:

Fitzgerald amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 117–273) that sought to strike the carve out for unions (by a yea-and-nay vote of 184 yeas to 246 nays, Roll No. 79). **Pages H3797–98, H3811–12**

H. Res. 979, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 963) and (H.R. 2116) was agreed to yesterday, March 16th.

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Expressing the hope for justice for the victims of Bloody Sunday, one of the most tragic of days during the Troubles, on its 50th anniversary as well as acknowledging the progress made in fostering peace in Northern Ireland and on the island of Ireland in recent decades: H. Res. 888, amended, expressing the hope for justice for the victims of Bloody Sunday, one of the most tragic of days during the Troubles, on its 50th anniversary as well as acknowledging the progress made in fostering peace in Northern Ireland and on the island of Ireland in recent decades; **Pages H3798–H3802**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "Condemning the killing of 14 individuals and violence on Bloody Sunday, one of the most tragic of days during the Troubles 50 years ago, and calling on all parties to take meaningful steps toward peace and reconciliation."; **Page H3802**

Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus: H.R. 7108, to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 424 yeas to 8 nays, Roll No. 78. **Pages H3802–10**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3810, H3811–12, H3812, and H3813.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Committee Meetings

United States Southern Command

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing entitled "United States Southern Command". Testimony was heard from General Laura J. Richardson, Commander, U.S. Southern Command. This hearing was closed.

NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES AND U.S. MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST AND AFRICA

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "National Security Challenges and U.S. Military Activities in the Greater Middle East and Africa". Testimony was heard from Sasha Baker, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Department of Defense; General Stephen Townsend, U.S. Army, Commander, U.S. Africa Command; and General Kenneth McKenzie, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, Commander, U.S. Central Command.

DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE POSTURE TO SUPPORT THE WARFIGHTERS AND POLICY MAKERS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Intelligence and Special Operations held a hearing entitled "Defense Intelligence Posture to Support the Warfighters and Policy Makers". Testimony was heard from Ronald M. Moultrie, Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security, Department of Defense; General Paul M. Nakasone, Commander, U.S. Cyber Command, Director, National Security Agency, and Chief, Central Security Service; and Lieutenant General Scott Berrier, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency, Department of Defense.

THE FUTURE OF MEDICINE: LEGISLATION TO ENCOURAGE INNOVATION AND IMPROVE OVERSIGHT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "The Future of Medicine: Legislation to Encourage Innovation and Improve Oversight". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 7066, the "Russia and Belarus Financial Sanctions Act"; H.R. 7081, the "Ukraine Comprehensive Debt Repayment Relief Act"; H.R. 7080, the "Nowhere to Hide Oligarchs' Assets"; H.R. 6891, the "Isolate Russian Government Officials Act"; and H.R. 6899, the "Russia and Belarus SDR Exchange Prohibition Act". H.R. 7066, H.R. 6891, H.R. 7080, H.R. 7081, and H.R. 6899 were ordered reported, as amended.

THE TARGETING OF BLACK INSTITUTIONS: FROM CHURCH VIOLENCE TO UNIVERSITY BOMB THREATS

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Targeting of Black Institutions: From Church Violence to University Bomb Threats''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

VOTING IN AMERICA: ENSURING FREE AND FAIR ACCESS TO THE BALLOT IN TEXAS

Committee on House Administration: Subcommittee on Elections held a hearing entitled ''Voting in America: Ensuring Free and Fair Access to the Ballot in Texas''. Testimony was heard from Andy Brown, Judge, Travis County, Texas; and public witnesses.

WORKPLACE PROTECTIONS FOR FEDERAL JUDICIARY EMPLOYEES: FLAWS IN THE CURRENT SYSTEM AND THE NEED FOR STATUTORY CHANGE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''Workplace Protections for Federal Judiciary Employees: Flaws in the Current System and the Need for Statutory Change''. Testimony was heard from M. Margaret McKeown, Circuit Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit; Julie A. Robinson, Senior Judge, U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing on H.R. 3431, the ''Increasing Community Access to Resiliency Grants Act of 2021''; H.R. 6491, the ''Salmon Focused Investments in Sustainable Habitats Act''; H.R. 6651, the ''Alaska Salmon Research Task Force Act''; H.R. 6785, the ''Right Whale Coexistence Act of 2022''; and H.R. 6987, to establish programs to reduce the impacts of vessel traffic and underwater noise on marine mammals, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from Representative Larsen of Washington; Janet Coit, Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Deputy Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

HBCUS AT RISK: EXAMINING FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''HBCUs at Risk: Examining Federal Support for Historically Black Colleges and Universities''. Testimony was heard from Michelle Asha Cooper, Acting Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education; Sean Haglund, Associate Director, Office for Bombing Prevention, Department of Homeland Security; Ryan T. Young, Executive Assistant Director, Intelligence Branch, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

MEMBER DAY HEARING ON PROXY VOTING AND REMOTE COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS AS ESTABLISHED BY H. RES. 965 OF THE 116TH CONGRESS

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Member Day Hearing on Proxy Voting and Remote Committee Proceedings as Established by H. Res. 965 of the 116th Congress'' [Original Jurisdiction Hearing]. Testimony was heard from Chairman Takano, Chairman Castor of Florida, and Representatives Biggs, DeSaulnier, Bost, Escobar, Davis of Illinois, Hoyer, C. Scott Franklin of Florida, Sánchez, Gallagher, Rose, Roy, Rutherford, Smith of Missouri, and Westerman.

SETTING THE STANDARDS: STRENGTHENING U.S. LEADERSHIP IN TECHNICAL STANDARDS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Setting the Standards: Strengthening U.S. Leadership in Technical Standards''. Testimony was heard from James K. Olthoff, Acting Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

AVIATION NOISE: MEASURING PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING COMMUNITY CONCERNS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing entitled ''Aviation Noise: Measuring Progress in Addressing Community Concerns''. Testimony was heard from Kevin Welsh, Executive Director, Office of Environment and Energy, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; Heather Krause, Director, Physical Infrastructure, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

BUILDING A BETTER VA: ADDRESSING HEALTHCARE WORKFORCE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION CHALLENGES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a business meeting to approve Majority and Minority Subcommittee Assignments, and hearing entitled ''Building a Better VA: Addressing Healthcare Workforce Recruitment and Retention Challenges''.

Subcommittee Assignments were approved. Testimony was heard from Gina Grosso, Assistant Secretary for Human Resources Administration/Operations, Security and Preparedness, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

HEARING WITH IRS COMMISSIONER RETTIG ON THE 2022 FILING SEASON

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled ''Hearing with IRS Commissioner Rettig on the 2022 Filing Season''. Testimony was heard from Charles P. Rettig, Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury.

INNOVATIVE WORKPLACES, HISTORIC SPACES: MODERNIZING HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Innovative Workplaces, Historic Spaces: Modernizing House Office Buildings''. Testimony was heard from J. Brett Blanton, Architect of the Capitol; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

BALTICS UNDER PRESSURE

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine the Baltics under pressure, after receiving testimony from Laima Andrikiene, Foreign Relations Committee of the Seimas, Parliament of Lithuania; Marko Mihkelson, Foreign Affairs Committee of the Riigikogu, Parliament of Estonia; and Rihards Kols, Foreign Affairs Committee of the Saeima, Parliament of Latvia.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D268)*

H.R. 2471, making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for providing emergency assistance for the situation in Ukraine. Signed on March 15, 2022. (Public Law 117–103)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 2022

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to receive a briefing on Ukraine's defensive needs, 10:30 a.m., WEBEX.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, March 21

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 4521, America COMPETES Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, March 18

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 2116—CROWN Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barr, Andy, Ky., E272
Bush, Cori, Mo., E271
Carter, Troy A., La., E272
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E271, E275, E277
Castro, Joaquin, Tex., E273, E278
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E276
Gomez, Jimmy, Calif., E272, E274
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E276
Hartzler, Vicky, Mo., E274
LaHood, Darin, Ill., E276
Levin, Mike, Calif., E278
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E275
Moore, Blake D., Utah, E279
Norman, Ralph, S.C., E271, E275
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E278
Scott, Robert ''Bobby'', Va., E273, E274, E276
Soto, Darren, Fla., E271, E272, E274, E274, E276, E277, E277, E278, E279
Tlaib, Rashida, Mich., E277
Valadao, David G., Calif., E278
Vela, Filemon, Tex., E273

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.